Jean Pierre Vaquier

NOTABLE BRITISH TRIALS SERIES

General Editor—HARRY HODGE

Trial	Date of Trial	Editor
Mary Queen of Scots	(1586)	A. Francis Steuart
King Charles I.	(1649)	J. G. Muddiman
Captain Porteous	(1736)	William Roughead
The Annesley Case	(1743)	Andrew Lang
Lord Lovat	(1747)	David N. Mackay
Mary Blandy	(1752)	William Roughead
James Stewart	(1752)	David N. Mackay
Eugene Aram	(1759)	Eric R. Watson
Katharine Nairn	(1765)	William Roughead
The Douglas Cause	(1761-1769)	A. Francis Steuart
Duchess of Kingston	(1776)	Lewis Melville
Deacon Brodie	(1788)	William Roughead
Abraham Thornton	(1817)	Sir John Hall, Bt.
Henry Fauntleroy	(1824)	Horace Bleackley
Thurtell and Hunt	(1824)	Eric R. Watson
Burke and Hare	(1828)	William Roughead
J. B. Rush	(1849)	W. Teignmouth Shore
William Palmer	(1856)	Eric R. Watson
Madeleine Smith	(1858)	F. Tennyson Jesse
Mrs. M'Lachlan	(1862)	William Roughead
Franz Muller	(1864)	H. B. Irving
Dr. Pritchard	(1865)	William Roughead
The Wainwrights	(1875)	H. B. Irving
The Stauntons	(1877)	J. B. Atlay
E. M. Chantrelle	(1878)	A. Duncan Smith
Kate Webster	(1879)	Elliott O'Donnell
City of Glasgow Bank	(1879)	William Wallace
Charles Peace	(1879)	W. Teignmouth Shore
Dr. Lamson	(1882)	H. L. Adam
Adelaide Bartlett	(1886)	Sir John Hall, Bt.
Mrs. Maybrick	(1889)	H. B. Irving
T. N. Cream	(1892)	W. Teignmouth Shore
A. J. Monson	(1893)	J. W. More
S. H. Dougal	(1903)	F. Tennyson Jesse
Adolf Beck	(1904)	Eric R. Watson
Oscar Slater	(1909)	William Roughead
H. H. Crippen	(1910)	Filson Young
J. A. Dickman	(1910)	S. O. Rowan-Hamilton
Steinie Morrison	(1911)	H. Fletcher Moulton
The Seddons	(1912)	Filson Young
George Joseph Smith	(1915)	Eric R. Watson
Sir Roger Casement	(1916)	George H. Knott
Bywaters and Thompson	(1922)	Filson Young
Ronald True	(1922)	Donald Carswell
H. R. Armstrong	(1922)	Filson Young
J. P. Vaquier	(1924)	R. H. Blundell R. E. Seaton
J. D. Merrett	(1927)	William Roughead

IN PREPARATION.

Captain Kidd	G. Chapman
The Bloody Assizes	Queen Caroline
Dr. Smethurst	Browne and Kennedy
Harold Greenwood	Gardiner (Peasenhall)
Field and Gray	

Wm. Hodge & Co., Ltd., Edinburgh and London



[*Photo. by Topical Press Agency.*

Jean Pierre Vaquier.

Trial of

Jean Pierre Vaquier

EDITED BY

R. H. Blundell

Barrister-at-Law, of the Inner Temple

AND

R. E. Seaton

Barrister-at-Law, of the Middle Temple

EDINBURGH AND LONDON

WILLIAM HODGE & COMPANY, LIMITED

MADE AND PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
BY
WILLIAM HODGE AND COMPANY, LIMITED
GLASGOW AND EDINBURGH
May, 1929

TO THE HONOURABLE

MR. JUSTICE AVORY

WHO PRESIDED AT THE TRIAL OF JEAN PIERRE VAQUIER

THIS VOLUME IS BY HIS KIND PERMISSION RESPECTFULLY

DEDICATED BY THE EDITORS

PREFACE.

The editors of this volume desire to express their appreciation of the assistance which has been afforded them by all persons who were in a position to help them. It has been the object of the editors to present this volume as an accurate report of the proceedings at Guildford Assizes, together with such additional relevant matter as might be of interest to the student of human nature.

The text of the evidence, exhibits, summing-up, and notice of appeal is reproduced by the courtesy of Sir A. Bodkin, Director of Public Prosecutions. An official shorthand note was not taken of counsels' speeches. These are reproduced from the *London Evening News*, by the courtesy of the editor.

R. H. B.
R. E. S.

Temple, *May*, 1929.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

Introduction, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - xiii
Leading Dates, - - - - - - - - - - - - - xxiii

THE TRIAL—

FIRST DAY—WEDNESDAY, 2ND JULY, 1924.

Opening Statement for the Crown, - - - - - - - - - 3

Evidence for Prosecution.

John Maitland Holman Bishop, - 5
William M'Bride, - - - 6
Mrs. Mabel Theresa Jones, - 6

SECOND DAY—THURSDAY, 3RD JULY, 1924.

Evidence for Prosecution (continued).

Mrs. Mabel Theresa Jones (*cross-examination continued*), - 50
Mrs. Elizabeth Mary Fisher, - 62
Mrs. Marcella Whitewick, - - 69
Mrs. Florence Mary Hutley, - 75
Ernest George Whitewick, - 77
Charles Henry Vincent, - - 78
David Gordon Ross, - - - 78
Walter Alfred Tutor, - - 79
George Norman Norris, - - 80
Wilfred Harry Jarratt, - - 81
Reginald Alexander Turgell, - 82
Arthur Francis Livermore, - 82
Annie Muff, - - - - 83
Horace Bland, - - - - 84

THIRD DAY—FRIDAY, 4TH JULY, 1924.

Evidence for Prosecution (concluded).

Horace Bland (*recalled*), - - 93
Dr. Frederick Charles Carle, - 93
Percy Ernest Cranford, - - 97
George Herbert Boutell, - - 98
Sir Bernard Henry Spilsbury, - 98
John Webster. - - - - 102
John Joseph Distard, - - - 103
Arthur Graham Russell, - - 104
John Joseph Distard (*recalled*), - 105
Major Alfred Curzon Watkins, - 105
Harry Ashton Wolfe, - - - 106
Isaac Schonberg, - - - 106
Ernest Boshier, - - - - 106

First Statement by the Accused, - - - - - - - - - 111
Second Statement, - - - - - - - - - - - - 113
Third Statement, - - - - - - - - - - - - 117
Fourth Statement, - - - - - - - - - - - - 119
Fifth Statement, - - - - - - - - - - - - 120
Statement by the Accused on Arrest, - - - - - - - - 121

Evidence for Defence.

Jean Pierre Vaquier, - - - - - - - - - - - - 122

PAGE

FOURTH DAY—SATURDAY, 5TH JULY, 1924.

Evidence for Defence (concluded).

Jean Pierre Vaquier (*recalled*), - - - - - - - - - - 147

Further Evidence for Prosecution.

Gerald Ernest Bruce Millar, - - - - - - - - - - - 148

Closing Speech for the Crown, - - - - - - - - - - 149
Closing Speech for the Defence, - - - - - - - - - 152
Charge to the Jury, - - - - - - - - - - - - 155
Verdict, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 169
Sentence, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 169

APPENDICES.

I. *Re* the Appeal Rex *v.* Vaquier, - - - - - - - - - 171
II. Exhibits, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 178

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.

Jean Pierre Vaquier,	*Frontispiece*	
Mrs. Jones,	*facing page*	21
The "Blue Anchor," Byfleet,	,,	37
The Bar Parlour,	,,	53
Sir Henry Curtis Bennett, K.C.,	,,	85
Mr. H. D. Roome, K.C.,	,,	101
Sir Edward Marshall Hall, K.C.,	,,	117
Mr. A. B. Lucy,	,,	133
Sir Patrick Hastings, K.C.,	,,	149
Mr. Justice Avory,	,,	165

JEAN PIERRE VAQUIER.

INTRODUCTION.

"Poison . . . of all forms of death the most detestable." It was in these words that Mr. Justice Avory described the death of Alfred Poynter Jones, and it is difficult to imagine a more fitting description. It is also difficult to imagine Jean Pierre Vaquier ever expecting that these words would be applicable to any action of his . . . of Jean Pierre Vaquier. If ever a man went to the scaffold in this country as a result of his own extreme vanity, it was the central figure in this case. When he came to England, probably the last thought in his mind was that he was entering upon the final stage of his career, or that he was going to be the central figure of such a tense drama as his romance with Mrs. Jones finally proved to be.

The other two persons of greatest importance in this story were Alfred Poynter Jones, the murdered man, and his wife, Mabel Theresa Jones. These two were married in 1906, and had a family of two children, one girl and one boy. Up to August of 1923 both were engaged together in the catering business, and Mrs. Jones showed herself to be a fairly competent business woman.

In August, 1923, Mr. Jones bought the Blue Anchor Hotel at Byfleet, Surrey, a place which later became for a time famous throughout the kingdom. In November of that year Mrs. Jones was in financial difficulties over a contract she had obtained during 1922 for the catering at Brookland Race Track, and in consequence she was being pressed by her creditors, until finally on 30th November a trustee was appointed, and Mrs. Jones drew up a deed of assignment in favour of her creditors. It might be in point here to add that Mr. Jones's financial position was by no means sound, so that it is quite clear that in perpetrating this crime monetary gain was certainly not Vaquier's motive.

Probably as a result of worry due to her financial position Mrs. Jones had a nervous breakdown, and on 4th January, 1924,

acting on her doctor's advice, she went to France to recuperate. It is really from this point that the story of this tragedy commences.

Mrs. Jones selected Biarritz as her holiday resort, and stayed at the Hotel Victoria, where Vaquier, employed as the wireless operator, worked the wireless set in the drawing-room. It may well be imagined that this Englishwoman, the wife of a country hotel-keeper, felt rather lost in such a large hotel in a foreign country, and was therefore only too willing to take friendship from any one who might show the least interest in her. Thus it came about that, within three days of her arrival at the hotel, she and Vaquier commenced a friendship which developed into a greater intimacy as time went on. Vaquier spoke no English, but a dictionary purchased by Mrs. Jones remedied to a certain extent the difficulties of conversation. And so these two persons carried on, each revealing to the other the domestic details of their lives.

Vaquier had been born the son of an agricultural dealer at Niort, in the Department of Aude. He received his education at the local State school, the French equivalent of the English board school, remaining there until attaining the age of fifteen. On leaving school he took up engineering, specialising in electrical work. In 1902 he married, and lived with his wife until 1917, when he enlisted in an engineering regiment of the French army, and worked at wireless at a depot at Augouleme. After demobilisation he again lived with his wife, but only for a very short period. In 1919, according to his own story, he was obliged to bring the marriage to an end by divorcing her, on the ground of infidelity. That representation is, of course, entirely his own, and cannot therefore too readily be accepted. In view of his general love and fascination for the opposite sex, and the taste of freedom that his brief spell in the army had already given him, the position was probably the reverse. Thereafter he occupied various situations in different parts of France, until, finally, he secured the permission of the management of the Hotel Victoria to give wireless concerts on his own behalf, using his own wireless set, which, it is interesting to note, contained a number of his own inventions.

On 16th January Mrs. Jones left Biarritz and visited Lourdes and Pau, in each place sending postcards to Vaquier, which he kept and which were produced during his subsequent trial at

Guildford Assizes. Vaquier also wrote a letter to Mrs. Jones in French, which she destroyed, as she was unable to understand it.

About 18th January Mrs. Jones returned to Biarritz, and from that time onwards her relationship with Vaquier became of a more intimate character. Mrs. Jones informed Vaquier during the course of a conversation that she was a bankrupt. Thereupon Vaquier suggested her moving to the Hotel de Bayonne, which would be cheaper, and accordingly booked a double room, and they stayed there as man and wife.

This period was ended by the arrival of a telegram from Mr. Jones, in which he asked his wife to return home. An exchange of gifts, a tie-pin in each case, may have helped the wife towards comforting Vaquier in his despair: "He cried, and begged me not to go home" is a passage in Mrs. Jones's evidence. On 4th February they left Biarritz together, and, having spent a night at Bordeaux, arrived in Paris the following day, where they stayed together at the Hotel Palais d'Orsay. While in Paris Vaquier told Mrs. Jones that he intended coming to England to sell the patent rights of a sausage machine which he had invented. On 8th February Mrs. Jones left Paris alone, and was met by her husband at Victoria.

It is not unfair to assume that Mrs. Jones did not tell her husband the story of two persons clearly very deeply infatuated with one another, living together and exchanging presents. The one a Basque, with all the strong Southern passion of his race, and the other no doubt fascinated and intrigued by the courtesy and attention of this curious little man.

On 9th February Vaquier arrived in London and booked a room at the Hotel Russell, at which he had previously been recommended to stay by Mrs. Jones. Within two days of his arrival he telegraphed Mrs. Jones, assisted in his English by the hotel inquiry clerk. The same evening Mrs. Jones met him at the hotel, and each appeared delighted to see the other. They dined together and spent the evening in conversation. The next day, 13th February, Mr. Jones went to Margate to recuperate after a slight illness. Mrs. Jones met Vaquier in London and spent the day with him, and in the evening they dined together, and Mrs. Jones, missing her last train back to Byfleet, spent the night with Vaquier at the hotel and returned home the next day. About this time Vaquier began visiting a chemist's shop, W. Jones & Co., at

134 Southampton Row. His visits were fairly frequent, and an acquaintanceship sprang up between Vaquier and a Mr. Bland, one of the partners of the firm, who spoke French. Vaquier, as a rule, bought ordinary toilet articles, though once or twice he purchased chemicals, such as cobalt nitrate, oxide of tin, acetate of copper, and sodium acetate. He explained to Bland that he required these for wireless experiments.

On 14th February Vaquier arrived, unexpectedly and without luggage, at the Blue Anchor Hotel, Byfleet. Apparently at this time he was running short of money, as he endeavoured to borrow money from Mrs. Jones in order to pay his bill at the Hotel Russell. Further, he asked to be allowed to remain at the Blue Anchor until he received money from his patent, which had hardly turned out to be the triumph that Vaquier prophesied it would be. Subsequently he paid the Hotel Russell out of the proceeds of a cheque for £14 lent to him by Mrs. Jones. During his stay at the Blue Anchor Vaquier paid marked attention to Mrs. Jones, and his conduct throughout was that of some one very deeply infatuated.

On 17th February Mr. Jones returned from Margate suffering from congestion of the lungs, and he was confined to bed for a fortnight under the care of his doctor. The coast was thus still clear for Vaquier to continue to be Mrs. Jones's constant lover. It was not until the end of February that Mr. Jones was well enough to get up, and even then he was still confined to his room.

On 1st March Vaquier went to London and visited the chemist's shop in Southampton Row. He saw Mr. Bland, and produced a list of chemicals, which included 20 grammes of perchloride of mercury and .12 of a gramme of strychnine, that is to say, all but 2 grains of strychnine, sufficient to kill four people. Mr. Bland was unwilling to serve him with these poisons until Vaquier assured him that he was a well-known wireless experimenter (a fact which was untrue), and that he could obtain any quantity of these poisons in France. Mr. Bland accordingly supplied him with the poisons, and Vaquier signed himself in the poison register under a false name, "J. Wanker." He took the poisons away with him, and called for the other chemicals later.

This purchase of strychnine occurred just at a time when Mr. Jones was recovering from his illness, and might therefore in future be a nuisance to Vaquier in his *affaire* with Mrs. Jones. One may well ask why, unless at that time

Vaquier had decided to murder Mr. Jones, he was buying strychnine, and why he was signing for it in a false name, and, in the light of subsequent events, why he bought it at all. It was proved at the trial that strychnine did not enter into wireless experiments; so, again, for some reason, Vaquier was lying.

On 3rd March Vaquier again went to London and booked a double room for himself and Mrs. Jones at the Hotel Russell. He met Mrs. Jones in the evening at Waterloo and both went to the hotel, and for the last time intimacy occurred between them. After dinner they left the hotel without paying the bill and returned to Byfleet. So far Vaquier had paid nothing towards his board and lodging at the Blue Anchor Hotel, and, on being asked about this, he assured Mr. Jones that he was getting £500 from America for his patent and asked him for a loan. Mrs. Jones, however, persuaded her husband not to lend him any money.

Vaquier repeatedly asked Mrs. Jones to leave her husband during his stay at Byfleet, but on each occasion she refused to do so, perhaps because by this time she was beginning to get tired of this little foreigner, who clearly had nothing to offer her, were she to have run away with him.

No doubt, during his stay at the Blue Anchor, Vaquier had observed that Mr. Jones was a heavy drinker, and that in the mornings after his drinking bouts he was in the habit of taking bromo salts. At all events, it was through the agency of these salts that Vaquier eventually administered the poison to Mr. Jones. The salts, as a rule, were kept on the bar-parlour mantelpiece, and therefore it was not a matter of any great difficulty for Vaquier to place strychnine in the bottle without being observed. On the evening of 28th March a party was held at the Blue Anchor, at which a number of people from the Byfleet locality attended. Vaquier retired to bed at 11 p.m. while the party was at its height. At midnight Mrs. Jones retired for the night, and the party continued until 1 a.m. the next day. Several of the guests were very drunk, and two of them remained for the night. Mr. Jones was the last to go to bed, and at that time appeared to be in good health; there is no doubt that he had had a good deal to drink during the evening, but he was comparatively sober.

The next day was a Saturday, and, as a result no doubt of the previous night's gaiety, Mr. and Mrs. Jones allowed themselves an extra hour in bed before making an appearance. They were

fortunate in having in Mrs. Fisher and Mrs. Whitewick an efficient cook and housekeeper. Vaquier was downstairs by seven o'clock, and made some coffee. He occupied himself during the whole of the next hour and three-quarters by drinking his coffee in the bar parlour. It had been his habit, prior to this morning, to sit in the coffee-room, where there was a gas fire, but on this particular day no one could move him from the bar-parlour. Mrs. Fisher, Mrs. Whitewick, and Mr. Jones himself tried at various times to persuade him to go into another room while the bar-parlour was being cleaned; but, in spite of their efforts, he preferred the discomfort. The probable reason lies in the fact that he had put his strychnine into the bromo salts, and was awaiting a suitable opportunity for replacing the bottle in its usual place. When he had done this, he had to stay in the room in order to prevent any person other than Mr. Jones from taking a dose.

However that may be, the fact remains that, whereas no one could give evidence at the trial that the bottle of salts was in its place before Mr. Jones came downstairs, it was there when he took his dose. It is impossible to say exactly how much strychnine was put into the bottle, but just over half a grain was found afterwards in Mr. Jones's body. It is from Mrs. Jones that we hear how her husband took his dose, exclaiming, "Oh, God! They're bitter," while Vaquier sat in the armchair watching, and no doubt wondering when the poison would take effect. Mrs. Jones tasted the salts herself, and then placed the bottle in a drawer of the kitchen dresser. She mixed an emetic and made tea for her husband, who drank them and vomited. Dr. Carle, the doctor who attended the Jones family, arrived ten minutes before midday. Mr. Jones was already dying, and during the next half an hour he exhibited almost every symptom of poisoning by strychnine. He was extremely terrified, and in a state of convulsions: these convulsions, which are a striking feature of poisoning by strychnine, affected every part of his body, with the exception of the lower part of his face. He died, asphyxiated, in spite of every effort made by Dr. Carle and Mrs. Jones.

The fact of the bottle being placed in a drawer by Mrs. Jones was of importance to Vaquier. He had to get to it for the purpose of washing it or of substituting another. He therefore waited until Dr. Carle was attending Mr. Jones upstairs. Mrs. Fisher was able

to say at the trial that, while she was in the kitchen, Vaquier rushed in shouting "Medicine, doctor, quick!" and she indicated the drawer in which the salts bottle had been placed. When the bottle was later examined by Dr. Carle it showed signs of having been recently washed out. This bottle, together with the spoon and tumbler used by Mr. Jones, were examined by Mr. Webster, the Home Office analyst, who found traces of strychnine in each. A comparison of this gentleman's evidence with that given by the experts in the case of *Reg.* v. *William Palmer* is not without interest. In the latter case great difficulty was experienced in proving that Cook died from strychnine poisoning. A large body of evidence was submitted at the trial for the purpose of comparing his symptoms with those of animals and humans who were known to have died from strychnine poisoning; whereas in this case Mr. Webster was able to give the amount of strychnine found in Mr. Jones's body to within one-tenth of a grain.

Vaquier remained at the Blue Anchor until 4th April, when he left for the Railway Hotel, at Woking. It seems that he was an unwelcome guest at Byfleet, and the suspicions of Mrs. Jones became a certainty before he left. His knowledge of English had improved sufficiently by this time for him to understand Mrs. Jones when she said, "You have assassinated Mr. Jones," and to reply in English, "Yes, Mabs, for you."

During these few days statements were taken by the local police from all the persons, including Vaquier, who were in the hotel on 28th-29th March. His first statement was made by him on 30th March. Vaquier, however, was not satisfied by making only one statement, and as a result proceeded to make three more in writing, which he handed to Superintendent Boshier at Woking on 1st, 6th, and 11th April. The reason for this apparent desire to tell the police all he knew is not clear from the statements themselves. Sir Henry Curtis Bennett explained them to the jury as the result of a mistaken impression on the mind of a foreigner ignorant of our procedure—an impression that he had to prove himself innocent. The Attorney-General, on the other hand, referred to them as showing a desire on the part of Vaquier to cast suspicion upon the friends and acquaintances of Mr. Jones. One thing is clear, that when asked in cross-examination by the Attorney-General if he could give any reasonable explanation for making the accusations, he was unable to do so. He was a popular figure at Woking. It

might almost be said that this was his undoing, as he allowed himself to be photographed for the press. One of these photographs happened to appear, on 16th April, in a daily paper read by Mr. Bland. This gentleman, no doubt rather surprised to see "Mr. Wanker's" photograph, gave some information to an official at New Scotland Yard.

On 19th April Vaquier was arrested, and thereupon he made another statement to the police. He was in due course brought before a bench of magistrates at Woking, and on 4th June was committed for trial.

The Court of Assize for the county of Surrey was held at Guildford in a hall, used chiefly for gay occasions, such as the local dances. The interior has the appearance of a temporary stage setting, which is helped by the fact that next door is the local theatre. It is fortunate that matinee performances do not coincide with the sitting of the Court, for the same corridor is used by the stall-holder in the theatre as by those who have business in the Court. The dock, like the rest of the "Court scene," is an erection bolted together for the occasion, a suitable environment for a man with Vaquier's outlook in life.

"Sensation" is a word which is to-day as much misused as any other, but in this particular case it must be admitted that the defence, as outlined by cross-examination of the witnesses for the prosecution, and amplified by the evidence-in-chief of the prisoner, was at least surprising. The greatest weakness in his case lay in his explanations of the purchase of strychnine, the absurdity of which was immediately evident to his counsel, but it was an absurdity which was never apparent to Vaquier. Vaquier told his story in the witness-box with the elegant *sang-froid* which characterised his attitude throughout his trial. The fact that he had never mentioned it in any of his many statements did not strike him as being at all unusual. It might not be unfair to say that he was unable to give any evidence which could have helped the jury in any way to arrive at any conclusion other than that he was guilty.

The untiring efforts made on his behalf by Sir H. Curtis Bennett and Mr. A. B. Lucy to weaken the evidence of Mrs. Jones and the other witnesses for the Crown only served to make it more clear to every man in Court, except Vaquier, that when the jury considered his own story there was only one verdict which they could return. The comment of Mr. Justice Avory on this

aspect of the case is notable, explaining to the jury the duty of defending counsel in such circumstances.

The appearance of being an interested and amused spectator of an entertainment arranged for his benefit was noticeable in Vaquier until the moment when the verdict of the jury was interpreted to him. He had kept up a neat appearance, arriving daily at the Assize Court with hair and beard brushed, and perfumed with violets. He wrote copious notes all day and every day, and kept the warders in the dock busy sharpening his pencils. All this time he listened attentively to the evidence as it was interpreted by Mr. Ashton Wolfe, and made comments upon points which struck him as being amusing. His joke upon the evidence of Mr. Boutell is perhaps worthy of record as showing his attitude throughout his trial. Mr. Boutell said in his evidence that he was a builder and undertaker, and Vaquier's comment to the interpreter was, "Ah! He houses them above and below ground!" Up to the Saturday upon which he was sentenced to death Vaquier was mainly concerned with the brilliantine and combs for his hair and the smartness of his personal appearance. He had, however, one complaint to make about the fairness of his trial; that he, the great Vaquier, was not allowed to take a greater personal part in the proceedings, that he should not be allowed to do all the acting, and most of the talking, seemed to him to be most unfair. It was only, and perhaps naturally, at the end of his trial that Vaquier showed his real feelings. The jury returned their verdict of "Guilty," and the prisoner, on being asked by the Clerk of Assize whether he had anything to say why the sentence of death should not be passed upon him, let loose a torrent of abuse directed at the learned judge and the members of the jury. He was removed still shouting after the sentence had been passed upon him.

The next development of the case occurred on 9th July. Vaquier, who was in Wandsworth Prison, made a statement to Major Watkins to the effect that on a certain day after the death of Mr. Jones he had seen a woman—Mrs. Jones or Mrs. Whitewick—go to the toolshed in the garden attached to the Blue Anchor. He also said that he had, on going to the toolshed, found on the wall behind a loose brick the bottle he had bought and given to Mr. Bruce Millar. He therefore impressed on Major Watkins to arrange for an anonymous letter to be sent to the police advising them to search this toolshed. Major Watkins immediately informed the police of his interview, and on 10th July the Deputy

Chief Constable of Surrey and Superintendent Boshier went to the Blue Anchor. They searched the toolshed, and behind a loose brick at the top of the wall found two small glass bottles with metal screw caps. The larger of these contained 23 grains (1.5 grammes) of strychnine, and the smaller one contained strychnine in solution.

There are four points to be remembered when considering what explanation can be found for the presence of this additional strychnine—

(1) The information came from Vaquier.

(2) That he desired that it should not appear to come from him.

(3) That he had purchased from Mr. Bland .12 gramme, or rather less than one-tenth of the amount which was found in the larger bottle.

(4) That Mrs. Jones and Mrs. Whitewick were immediately interviewed, and after being closely questioned were able to satisfy the police that they knew nothing about it.

If the police had found this strychnine before the trial it is difficult to say whether or not the presence of a large quantity of strychnine in that toolshed (not traced to Vaquier's possession) would have told in his favour. The police did not succeed in discovering where or by whom this quantity of poison was obtained.

Vaquier's application for leave to appeal against conviction and sentence was argued before the Lord Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Shearman, and Mr. Justice Sankey on 28th July. The notice of appeal and *Times* report of the proceedings will be found in Appendix I. at the end of the volume. An effort was made by Vaquier to get leave for himself to give evidence in support of his story to Major Watkins. This was disallowed on the ground that the evidence might have been given at the trial.

The argument on the exclusion of women from the jury at the trial, and the attempts to find fault with Mr. Justice Avory's summing-up meeting with no more success, the application was dismissed. The result was interpreted to him, and Vaquier again resisted violently when being removed from the dock. This occasion was the last upon which Vaquier was seen by the general public. He returned to Wandsworth Gaol, where, on 12th August, the sentence which had been passed upon him was duly carried out.

Leading Dates in the Vaquier Case.

1879.		Jean Pierre Vaquier born at Niort, Aude, France.
1902.		Married.
1906.		Mr. and Mrs. Jones married.
1919.		Vaquier divorced wife at Bordeaux.
1923.	Aug.	Mr. Jones purchased Blue Anchor Hotel, Byfleet, Surrey.
,,	Nov.	Mrs. Jones drew up deed of assignment in favour of her creditors.
1924.	Jan.	Mrs. Jones arrived at Hotel Victoria, Biarritz.
,,	9th ,,	Commencement of friendship with Vaquier.
,,	16th ,,	Mrs. Jones left Biarritz for Lourdes and Pau.
,,	18th ,,	Mrs. Jones returned to Biarritz.
,,	19th ,,	Mrs. Jones and Vaquier occupied bedroom at Hotel Bayonne, Biarritz, until
,,	4th Feb.	Mrs. Jones and Vaquier left Biarritz for Paris.
,,	5th ,,	Mrs. Jones and Vaquier occupied room at Palais d'Orsay Hotel, Paris.
,,	8th ,,	Mrs. Jones left Paris for Byfleet.
,,	9th ,,	Vaquier left Paris for London and occupied room at Hotel Russell.
,,	12th ,,	Mrs. Jones met Vaquier by appointment at Hotel Russell.
,,	13th ,,	Mr. Jones left Byfleet for Margate.
		Vaquier paid first visit to W. Jones & Co., chemists, Southampton Row.
		Vaquier and Mrs. Jones spent this night together at Hotel Russell.
,,	14th ,,	Vaquier arrived at Blue Anchor Hotel, Byfleet.
,,	17th ,,	Mr. Jones returned from Margate.
		Remained in bed for next fortnight suffering from congestion of the lungs.
,,	1st Mar.	Vaquier went to London. Called on W. Jones & Co.; purchased 12 grammes of strychnine; signed poison register "J. Wanker."
,,	3rd ,,	Vaquier went to London. Booked double room at Hotel Russell. Met Mrs. Jones in evening. Went to hotel; connection for last time.
,,	28th ,,	Party at Blue Anchor.
,,	29th ,,	Alfred Poynter Jones murdered by strychnine poisoning administered in dose of bromo salts.
,,	30th ,,	Vaquier's first statement at Woking Police Station.
,,	1st Apr.	Vaquier's second statement.
,,	4th ,,	Vaquier moved to Railway Hotel, Woking.
,,	6th ,,	Vaquier's third statement.
,,	11th ,,	Vaquier's fourth statement.
,,	17th ,,	Mr. Bland made statement to police.

Leading Dates in the Vaquier Case—*continued.*

1924.	19th Apr.	Vaquier arrested. Made fifth statement.
,,	9th May.	Proceedings commenced before bench of magistrates at Woking.
,,	4th June.	Vaquier committed to Guildford Assizes for trial.
,,	2nd July.	Trial commenced at Guildford Assizes.
,,	5th ,,	Jury returned verdict of "Guilty."
,,	28th ,,	Application for leave to appeal against verdict and sentence —dismissed.
,,	12th Aug.	Vaquier hanged at His Majesty's Prison of Wandsworth.

THE TRIAL

AT

SURREY SUMMER ASSIZES, GUILDFORD.

WEDNESDAY, 2ND JULY, 1924.

Judge—

MR. JUSTICE AVORY.

Counsel for the Crown—

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir Patrick Hastings, K.C.),
Sir EDWARD MARSHALL HALL, K.C.,
Mr. H. D. ROOME, and
Mr. GEORGE ANSLEY.
(Instructed by the Director of Public Prosecutions.)

Counsel for the Prisoner—

Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT, K.C., and
Mr. A. B. LUCY.
(Instructed by Mr. H. Hunt, Woking, Surrey.)

Mr. F. J. POWELL and Mr. C. T. ABBOTT held watching briefs on behalf of Mrs. Jones.
(Instructed by Messrs. W. H. Speed & Co., London.)

THE TRIAL.

First Day—Wednesday, 2nd July, 1924.

The Clerk of Assize—Jean Pierre Vaquier, you stand charged upon this indictment with having on the 29th day of March——

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—My lord, this will have to be interpreted to the prisoner. He does not understand English.

The interpreter, Mr. H. Ashton Wolfe, was duly sworn.

The Clerk of Assize—Jean Pierre Vaquier, you stand charged upon this indictment with having on the 29th day of March of this year, at Byfleet, in this county, murdered Alfred George Poynter Jones. Are you guilty or not guilty?

Jean Pierre Vaquier—Not guilty.

The jury having been duly sworn—

The Clerk of Assize—Gentlemen of the jury: The prisoner, Jean Pierre Vaquier, stands charged upon this indictment for that he on the 29th day of March, in the present year, at Byfleet, in this county, murdered Alfred George Poynter Jones. To this indictment he has pleaded not guilty. Your duty is to say whether he is guilty or not and to hearken to the evidence.

Opening Statement for the Crown.

The Attorney-General, opening the case for the Crown, said it was now alleged that the accused took the life of Mr. Jones by administering to him one of the most deadly of poisons—strychnine. Mr. Jones, who was the proprietor and licensee of a licensed house at Byfleet, came down early in the morning on 29th March to take a dose of harmless medicine known as bromo salts. He poured the requisite amount of this medicine into a glass, added water to it, drank it, and within an hour died a most agonising death. The Attorney-General said he thought the jury would have no doubt that Jones died of strychnine poisoning. "The case that I shall have to present before you is that the strychnine in question was bought by the accused, and was administered to the dead man by the accused. It is, of course, no part of my duty, or the duty of those associated with me in this prosecution, to supply evidence

The Attorney-General

of motive for this murder, but certain facts will be brought before you which, with the submission that I shall have to make in this case, afford ample evidence of a motive for the crime; for I think I shall be in a position to prove to your satisfaction that the accused had, within the preceding month or so, developed an illicit passion for the dead man's wife, and it may very well be that you will come to the conclusion that that is the motive, or one of the motives, which actuated this crime.

"With regard to the financial affairs of Mrs. Jones, after Mr. Jones had bought the Blue Anchor Hotel her financial position became extremely bad, and at the end of 1923 she executed a deed of assignment in favour of her creditors." Describing her meeting with Vaquier at Biarritz, and referring to their association in France, the Attorney-General said: "I have to tell you of these stories because the prisoner has made a statement to the effect that at no time did he have any improper relations with Mrs. Jones. But I think I can tell you that there will be corroborative evidence which will put the matter beyond dispute that there were improper relations between the accused and the wife of the dead man."

Mrs. Jones returned to England on 8th February, and on 9th February Vaquier reached the Hotel Russell, London, and signed the hotel registration book. That signature, the Attorney-General said, might be important if there was a dispute as to the signature of Vaquier. If it became an important matter they would have to compare that writing with the writing in another book. "I do not think," he added, "you will have very much difficulty, because the prisoner writes the letter 'A' in a very peculiar manner. It is, in fact, a most unusual way to write the letter 'A,' and I should think it is written in a way that is almost unique. It looks like an inverted '9,' and he seems to begin on the inside of the 'A,' writes around, and then puts the tail of the 'A' at the end. I draw your attention to that peculiarity because if the matter becomes vital you can look at the 'A' in other signatures and the 'A' in all his writings." It was quite obvious that at any rate one of Vaquier's reasons for coming to England was to see Mrs. Jones and to resume as far as possible his relationship with her.

During Vaquier's stay at the Blue Anchor, Byfleet, he asked Mrs. Jones to lend him money to pay his bill at the Hotel Russell. The bill amounted to £8 9s. 2d., and Mrs. Jones gave him a cheque for £14, Vaquier keeping the balance for himself. From the evidence of the people who lived and worked at the hotel it would be obvious that the accused was extremely fond of Mrs. Jones. To what extent she was fond of him was a matter that was of little importance.

In connection with Vaquier's alleged purchase of strychnine on 1st March, the Attorney-General asked: "Why did the prisoner

buy strychnine? Why did he want to buy that small quantity which was certain death to whoever took it? Why did he want to sign the book in a false name? What was his object in taking away with him that small quantity of certain death? Nobody saw him conducting any wireless experiments. He had no apparatus there. He had nothing, so far as I can tell you, with which he could conduct wireless experiments. There was the ordinary wireless set belonging to the hotel, but nobody had any idea that he was practising wireless experiments."

Speaking of the occurrences on 29th March, the day of Mr. Jones's death, and of the prisoner's statements, "We seek to prove," the Attorney-General concluded, "the infatuation which existed between this man and the dead man's wife, and we seek to prove that this was a possible motive for the crime—one of the strongest ruling motives which this world has ever known. We seek to prove that he bought a deadly poison in a false name. We seek to prove that he was in the room when the tragedy occurred, that he knew where the bottle was, and that he was in the room practically continuously during the whole of the time, and that he was seen to be manipulating the bottles on the mantelpiece after the poison had been administered. We seek to prove that the accused saw where the bottle containing the residue of the poison had been taken, that he saw it put into the drawer, and that the accused was the man who came down and asked for it. He went to the place where the bottle was, and when seen said some one had washed the bottle out. These facts, if you believe them, in the submission of the Crown, are sufficient to prove the accused guilty."

Evidence for the Prosecution.

John Maitland Holman Bishop, examined by Sir Edward Marshall Hall—I am an architect's assistant, and I reside at 20 Desborough Street, Pimlico. I am accustomed to the making of plans, and have prepared a plan of the Blue Anchor Hotel at Byfleet, which I produce. I have marked the rooms in the plan according to the numbers which they bear. On the left side of the plan there is the ground floor. On the extreme right there is the coffee-room, and next to that the kitchen. There is no direct communication between the coffee-room and the kitchen; you have to go into a passage. Next to the kitchen is the scullery, which is entered from the kitchen. There is a store and a larder communicating with the scullery. The passage coming out of the coffee-room runs direct to the bar parlour at the back of the house, and next to the bar parlour is the tap-room. At the side of that there is a public bar. There is a door between the public bar and the tap-room. The bar parlour communicates direct with

the passage. On the other side, the left-hand side, there is a saloon bar and a private bar, and there is a large space reserved for service. There is a door between the passage and the entrance to the bar parlour. The arrow indicates the direction of the stairs up. There is also a door from the bar parlour into the serving space. There are a number of bedrooms upstairs.

Cross-examined by Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—In the scullery, as usual, there is a sink, and at the end of the passage, beyond the entrance into the kitchen, there is the lavatory and water-closet. On the first floor the corner bedroom on the right is bedroom No. 7, and next door to No. 7 is the bathroom. I could not say whether there is hot and cold water laid on in that bathroom. Halfway between the ground floor and the first floor there is a place described as a lounge. It is not quite halfway down. I should say that that would be a suitable room for dancing in.

Inspector WILLIAM M'BRIDE, examined by Sir EDWARD MARSHALL HALL—I am a detective-inspector at New Scotland Yard, and I am also a photographer. On 6th May I took nine photographs, which are all bound up together in one book, numbered 1 to 9 consecutively. That book is a duplicate. The first one is a photograph of the outside of the Blue Anchor Hotel, Byfleet. No. 2 is a photograph of the interior of the bar parlour. That photograph shows the mantelpiece. On the left of the mantelpiece, as one looks at the photograph, there is a bureau and a cupboard over it, and on the right side the photograph shows a wireless apparatus and a portion of a loud speaker. It also shows on the floor the batteries for connecting up with the apparatus. On the side of that there is an armchair. On the mantelpiece there is a clock, also a watch and a bottle. Photograph No. 3 is the passage from the bar parlour to the coffee-room. Photograph No. 4 is another passage from the coffee-room to the back door. Photograph No. 5 is the interior of the gentlemen's lavatory, showing the lavatory basin and closet. Photograph No. 6 is the kitchen. The dresser is on the extreme right of the photograph, and it contains three drawers. Photograph No. 7 is a photograph of the same dresser taken direct from the fireplace. Photograph No. 8 is another passage, and photograph No. 9 is the back of the house.

Mrs. MABEL THERESA JONES, examined by Sir EDWARD MARSHALL HALL—I am the widow of Alfred George Poynter Jones. I am now living at 361 Upper Richmond Road, Barnes, having left the Blue Anchor Hotel, Byfleet. I was married to Mr. Jones in 1906, and I have two children; my boy was eighteen in June and my daughter is fifteen. Before the war my husband was managing director of a company known as Jones, Sidney, Ltd., which carried

on business as costumiers in London. I believe they stopped trading shortly after the war began, although I really do not know very much about my husband's business, because I was an invalid at the time. About 1915 or 1916 my husband joined the army; I could not tell the exact date. I then commenced a business in Kingston on my own account as a caterer, at Nos. 2 and 4 High Street. That business was successful. After my husband left the army he came to me as manager at a salary of £6 a week. In 1921 I opened a refreshment room known as "The Chalet" in addition to my shop. Up to 1922 that business was also successful. After 1922—about the end of 1923—my business was unsuccessful. Besides my business at Kingston I had Brooklands catering. My husband did not, as far as I know, buy the lease of any premises. In August, 1923, we went to the Blue Anchor at Byfleet. That was my husband's business. He did not buy the lease; as far as I know, he bought the business. I went to live there with my husband. The licence was transferred to him and he became the licensee. The house belonged to the Isleworth Brewery at the time. In November, 1923, I signed a deed of assignment, and on 10th January a receiving order was made against me, I believe; I was not there. I went to France on or about 10th January. I believe it was before the receiving order that I went to France. The reason for my going to France was because I had a nervous breakdown. I had been consulting a doctor at the time. I travelled alone. I first of all went to Paris, then from Paris to Biarritz, and from Biarritz to Lourdes. I stayed at the Hotel Victoria at Biarritz. I think it would be about the 9th when I arrived at Biarritz, but I cannot be sure. At that hotel at Biarritz I met Mr. Vaquier, the accused. I saw him first in the dining-room of the hotel; he was having dinner in the dining-room. There was a wireless set at the hotel in the drawing-room. There were English concerts given through the wireless.

Had the accused anything to do with the wireless?—Yes, he operated the wireless.

Who spoke? Did you speak to him or did he speak to you first?—He spoke to me.

Did you understand French at that time?—No.

In what language did he speak to you?—He spoke to me in French, and I told him I was sorry I did not understand what he was talking about.

Did you understand what he said to you in French?—No, I could not if I do not understand French.

That same day, after lunch, did you go into the lounge?—Yes.

Were you having coffee?—Yes.

Did he convey something to you?—About getting a dictionary; he asked me if I would get a dictionary and he would teach me French.

Mrs Mabel T. Jones

Do you remember the word he used?—No, I could not tell you —some word like dictionary.

Did you go out into the town, and did you buy a dictionary?—Yes, I went down to the town and I had my hair dressed, and I bought a dictionary and returned.

After that did you meet him on the sands?—Yes.

Was any use made of the dictionary?—Yes, we conversed by the dictionary.

Just explain what was done with the dictionary?—The accused asked me was I married or divorced. I said I was married and had two children.

Did he ask you where you lived?—Yes.

Did you tell him where you lived?—Yes.

Look at that [shown a negative]. Is that the negative of a photograph you took of him on the beach at Biarritz?—It is not *the* negative; it is a negative, but not the negative.

Did you get friendly with him?—Yes.

Did he tell you anything about himself, whether he was married or anything?—He told me that he was divorced; his wife had died and he had two children, and his children were dead.

Did he tell you where he lived?—No, not then.

After you had been at Biarritz for a few days did you go to Lourdes?—Yes.

Did you write to the accused from Lourdes?—I believe I sent a postcard from Lourdes.

Then did you go to a place called Pau?—Yes.

Whilst you were at Lourdes, or at Pau, did you receive a letter from the accused?—There was a letter from the accused at Lourdes.

Is that the postcard which you sent to Vaquier from Lourdes [shown postcard]?—Yes, that is my writing.

Then did you receive a letter from him, and was it written in French?—In French, at Lourdes.

What has become of that?—I have destroyed it; I could not understand it.

Mr. Justice Avory—Are you going to have that postcard read?

Sir Edward Marshall Hall—Yes, both of them shall be read in a moment.

The Clerk of Assize—It is addressed to "Jean Pierre Vaquier, Esq., Victoria Hotel, Biarritz, France. 16/1/24. Dear Friend, Have arrived safely, am going to Pau to-morrow morning. On my arrival I found a telegram awaiting me from home. M. Jones." The postmark is difficult to read.

Examination continued—On 17th January did you send that postcard (handing a postcard to witness) in answer to the letter which you have destroyed?—Yes.

The Clerk of Assize—"17/1/24. Dear Friend, I thank you

for your letter, and if possible will return to Biarritz unless something unforeseen turns up. Kind regards, Mabel Jones."

Examination continued—Did you in fact return to Biarritz shortly after that?—Yes.

And did you go to the Hotel Victoria?—Yes.

How long did you stay at the Victoria then?—I should think for about a week.

And was Vaquier there?—Yes, he was there.

And did you renew your friendship?—Yes.

Up to this time had there been immoral relations between you and him?—No.

How long do you think you stayed at the Victoria the second time?—About a week.

Why did you leave the Victoria?—Mr. Vaquier said it was much cheaper to go to another hotel.

What was the other hotel he suggested as cheaper?—The Hotel Bayonne.

Did you go to the Hotel Bayonne?—Yes.

Did he go to the Bayonne to stay, or did he remain at the Victoria?—He stayed at the Bayonne.

While you were at the Bayonne did you have dinner with Vaquier?—Yes.

Did he book a room?—Yes.

What sort of room?—He booked a double room.

How many days did you stay at the Bayonne?—I could not tell you exactly. It may have been three or four days, or it may have been a week; I am not sure.

During that time what room did you occupy?—A room with Mr. Vaquier.

Living with him as his wife?—Yes.

I have the bill of that hotel, which is exhibit No. 15. Who paid the bill at the Bayonne Hotel?—I paid my share.

I think it is well to call attention to this bill. Look at that and identify it. [Exhibit No. 15 handed to the witness.]

Mr. Justice Avory—Who produces it?

Sir Edward Marshall Hall—It was found in the accused's possession, and both the postcards were also found in his possession. I prove it from another source. I just want to call attention to one thing.

Mr. Justice Avory—The dates are from 28th January up to 4th February.

Sir Edward Marshall Hall—That is right. There are always two dinners, two breakfasts, two everything.

Examination continued—During that time the bill charges for two of everything?—Yes.

Whilst you were at the Hotel Bayonne did you receive a telegram from your husband?—Yes.

Did you tell Mr. Vaquier that you had received that telegram?—Yes.

Mrs Mabel T. Jones

Did you tell him what it contained?—Yes.

What became of it?—I could not tell you.

You have not got it?—I could not tell you.

Did you tell Mr. Vaquier the purport of its contents?—Yes.

What did you tell Vaquier?—That it was for me to return home.

What did he say when you told him that?—He cried, and begged me not to go home.

As a matter of fact, did you leave Biarritz on 4th February; that is the date the bill was paid?—Yes, I expect it was that date. I could not tell you for certain.

Where did you go?—I went to Bordeaux.

Did you go alone?—No, Mr. Vaquier came with me.

Did you stay at Bordeaux?—Yes.

The night?—Yes, one night.

Did you and Mr. Vaquier stay separately or together?—Together.

The next day you both went to Paris?—That is right.

By the midday train. When you went to Paris did you stay at a hotel which you now know to be the Hotel Palais d'Orsay?—Yes.

You got there on the 5th: how long did you stay there?—Until the morning of the 8th, I think it was.

Who paid the bill at Bordeaux?—I left the money to pay my share of the bill at Bordeaux with Mr. Vaquier.

Who paid the bill at the Palais Hotel?—Which Palais?

At the d'Orsay Hotel?—That is the hotel you were speaking of just now?

Who paid the bill at the Bordeaux Hotel?—I paid my share.

Did you come back to England on 8th February?—On the 8th, yes.

Before you came back to England did Vaquier say anything to you about coming to England himself?—Yes, he said he was coming to England.

When, as you say, you told him where you lived, had he made a note of it, as far as you know?—Yes, he wrote it down.

When he told you he was coming to England did he tell you where he was going to stay?—He asked me if I could recommend him a hotel. I recommended him to the Hotel Russell.

Did you get back to England on the same day, the 8th, that you left Paris?—Yes, on the Friday it was.

Did your husband meet you at Victoria with a motor and drive you home?—Yes.

The next day did you go to the bankruptcy officials in London?—Yes.

Did your husband receive a telegram on 12th February [exhibit No. 16]?—I could not quite tell you the date, but I believe it was that day.

Was that telegram subsequently given to you?—It was read to me over the telephone.

[Shown exhibit No. 16]—Is that the telegram you afterwards found as the original of what was read to you over the telephone?—Yes, I should say so, but not that one.

By Mr. Justice Avory—I do not quite follow. Where were you when this telegram arrived?—I was in London at the Official Receiver's office, and then I went up to the solicitor's office, and a telephone message had been left for me there.

Examination continued—When you got home that evening did you see the telegram which purported to have been read to you?—Yes.

Is this the telegram: "Southampton Row, 12th February, 1924, 2.32 p.m., to: Mrs. Jones, Blue Anchor Hotel, Byfleet. Arrived from Paris on business. Shall be very pleased to see you Hotel Russell and to meet Mr. Jones. Perhaps you will inform me what evening. From: Vaquier"?—Yes, something like that, I should say.

A witness will prove that he translated that from French into English. Did you go the same day or the next day to the Hotel Russell?—The same evening.

At what time did you get to the Hotel Russell?—I should think about seven or just after.

Did you see Vaquier there?—Yes.

How did he greet you?—He kissed me.

Did you have dinner with him?—Yes.

Did anything else occur that evening?—He took me up to his room, his bedroom.

Did you have any conversation with him?—Yes.

How?—By the dictionary.

Was there any intercourse between you then?—No.

Did you make any arrangement as to meeting him in the future on that day?—I do not think so.

Did you go back to Byfleet that same evening?—Yes.

And next day do you remember whether your husband went anywhere?—My husband went away for the day, and whilst he was away he was taken ill.

Can you tell me what day it was your husband went to Margate?—I believe it was on the 13th.

The same day as your husband went to Margate did you go to London?—Yes.

Did you meet Vaquier?—Yes.

Was that by appointment or not?—No, I do not think I made an appointment to meet him. I am not quite sure, but I met him. I went up to the Bankruptcy Receiver's office in 29 Russell Square.

Do you remember where you met Vaquier that day?—Yes, I met him at Waterloo Station—I believe it was by appointment—and I took him on to lunch.

You think it was by appointment?—Yes, I think so.

You took him out to lunch?—Yes.

On that occasion you were the hostess; you paid for the meal?—Yes.

Did you see at Waterloo Station a man whom you now know as a man named Schulte, an interpreter?—Yes.

You did not speak to Mr. Schulte?—Not then.

You said you went to the Bankruptcy place. Was that after lunch or before?—After.

What became of Vaquier whilst you went to the Bankruptcy Buildings?—I could not tell you what became of him.

After that did you go to the Hotel Russell?—Yes, afterwards.

Did you see Vaquier there?—Yes.

Tell us what took place?—I saw him. He was writing in the writing-room.

Did you have any meal with him?—I had dinner with him.

After dinner how long did you stay talking to him?—I stayed quite late, and I lost my train.

Just answer this question yes or no. Whilst you were at the Hotel Russell did you send a telephone message to Byfleet?—Yes.

Did you leave the hotel alone or with anybody?—With Mr. Vaquier.

At about what time did you leave?—Well, I got to the station just to a minute to the time the train went out; I just got my ticket and the train went out—just as I was getting my ticket.

Did you in fact catch the train?—No.

Which train was that?—The 11.40.

The train having gone, what did you do?—I went back with Mr. Vaquier.

When you got back to the Hotel Russell did you ask him to do something?—I asked him if he would book a room for me.

In point of fact, what room did you occupy that night?—The same room as he.

Did you sleep in the same bed?—Yes.

And the next morning did you telephone down for hot water?—Yes.

Did the chambermaid, whom we now know as Annie Muff, come up?—Yes.

Did she bring some hot water?—She came up first.

Did she say something to you and to Vaquier while she was there?—Yes.

Did he mumble something?—He mumbled something.

Did you say something to the chambermaid yourself?—Yes.

What did you say?—I said, "It is all right; I am his wife."

After the chambermaid left did you say something to Vaquier?—Yes, I told him he had put me in a nice plight or position—something like that.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Did you say that in English to him?—Yes.

By that time was he understanding?—No, he simply got the dictionary.

Examination continued—Anyhow, did he understand what you said to him?—No. I got the dictionary and explained it to him.

Did you make him understand by the dictionary?—Yes. He said it was quite all right; he would put it right with the manager.

Then I think you went downstairs and had a cup of coffee and then went back to Byfleet?—Yes.

When you got to Byfleet was your husband there?—No, he was not there. I expected him to be there.

That evening did anybody arrive?—Yes, Mr. Vaquier arrived.

Did he bring any luggage with him?—No.

Were you expecting him?—No.

What did you ask him, or what did he say to you?—He asked if he might remain there for a month until he got his money for his patent.

This was on 14th February, the same day?—The 14th.

When were you expecting your husband back?—I expected him back the same day, the 14th.

When Vaquier asked you if he might stay, what did you say?—I told him I would ask my husband.

Did your husband return that day?—No, he did not return till the Sunday—he was too ill—but he telephoned.

Did Vaquier stay there that night?—Yes.

Just to get this in one sentence: did he sleep there every night until 3rd April, when he left?—Yes.

[Shown exhibit No. 17]—Is that a portion of the visitors' book at the Byfleet Hotel?—Yes, I think it is.

Did you see Vaquier sign that book?—Yes. [Witness identified his signature in exhibit No. 17.]

You told me he did not bring any luggage with him when he came on the 14th. Did some luggage arrive subsequently?—He fetched it on the Saturday.

Would that be the 15th?—I could not tell you; it was on the Saturday.

Before he fetched the luggage did he ask you for anything?—Yes, he asked me if I would lend him some money.

In point of fact did you lend him something?—Yes, I lent him a cheque for £14 [exhibit No. 18]. It was on the Saturday he asked for the money.

Did he tell you why he wanted the money?—To pay his hotel bill at the Hotel Russell.

[Shown exhibit No. 18]—Is that the cheque you gave him?—That is the cheque.

This cheque is a cheque drawn by your husband?—Yes, to me.

Dated 3rd December, 1923, payable to bearer for £14, drawn by your husband on his bank at Kingston?—Yes.

How had you become possessed of that cheque?—My husband gave it to me.

On or about the date it bears?—The same day.

Had you kept it in your possession since then?—It was in the drawer.

Is that your writing on the back of it?—My signature, yes.

The cheque bears this rubber stamp: "Barclay's Bank, Limited, Bloomsbury," and it has on it "19th February, 1924."

Mr. Justice Avory—It is crossed to the account of the Hotel Russell.

Examination continued—Did Vaquier tell you how much his bill was at the Hotel Russell?—No, he did not tell me.

Have you ever been repaid any portion of that £14?—No, never.

Your husband came back on Sunday, 17th February?—Yes.

As far as you know, what was the first time that Vaquier saw your husband?—On the Sunday.

Had you told Vaquier that he could stay at the hotel before your husband came back?—Yes, I told my husband on the Saturday over the 'phone that Vaquier was there.

Did you communicate that fact to Vaquier?—Yes.

You told him he could stay?—Yes.

That your husband had given permission?—Yes.

When your husband came back was he very ill?—Yes, he had congestion of the lungs.

Was he in bed for a fortnight and confined to his room for a further week under the attendance of Dr. Carle?—Yes, I think for about three weeks he was upstairs.

During those three weeks we know that Vaquier was in the hotel. Did Vaquier ever go anywhere during those three weeks?—Yes, he went up to town; he used to go up to town occasionally.

Did you ever go to town with him?—He followed me to town once; I went up to town once with him.

Can you give me any date when it was that you went up to town with him?—No, I cannot give you any dates.

Did you ever go back to the Hotel Russell during this time?—Yes.

How many times?—Once.

Do you remember any occasion when you met Vaquier at the station before you went to the Hotel Russell?—Yes, that was the time.

What time did you meet him at Waterloo?—I should think it was about seven o'clock.

Did you go with him to the Hotel Russell?—Yes.

What time did you arrive there?—I could not tell you exactly the time.

Was it before or after dinner?—It was before dinner.

Where did you dine that night?—At the Hotel Russell.

Who with?—With Vaquier.

Before dinner did anything take place?—Yes.

Evidence for Prosecution.

Mrs Mabel T. Jones

What took place. What did he do?—He took me up to his room upstairs.

What sort of a room was it, a bedroom or a sitting-room?—A double bedroom.

Did you have connection with him on that occasion?—Yes.

Was that the last time it took place?—Yes.

Had he ever had connection with you at the Byfleet Hotel?—No.

Who did you dine with?—I dined with Vaquier.

Did you go back to Byfleet that night?—Yes.

Did any one go with you?—Vaquier. We went back together.

We can fix that date. We now know that it was the 3rd March?—I could not tell you.

About this time, on a Sunday, do you remember an incident happening when you went for a long walk?—Yes.

Can you tell me about which Sunday that was?—I could not tell about which Sunday it was. It was on one Sunday.

What day of the week was it, do you remember, that you went up and this took place at the Hotel Russell the last time?—It was on a Monday.

Was the incident you are going to tell us about, which happened on a Sunday, before you went up to the Hotel Russell or after?—That I could not tell you.

Do you remember this occasion when you went for this walk to Wisley?—Yes.

How long were you out? Was it morning or afternoon?—It was in the morning when I went. I think I returned about three o'clock.

Do you remember whether or not you had been crying that morning?—Yes.

Had you seen Vaquier that morning before you went out?—I had seen him first thing in the morning.

Had he seen you crying?—No.

Why were you crying?—Just something that hurt me, I suppose, with my husband.

Did you take the dog with you?—Yes, a fox terrier.

Did you leave word to say where you had gone?—Yes; I said if Mr. Jones asked where I had gone, I had gone for a walk across the fields.

How long were you out before you came back?—I could not tell you. I should think about two hours. I am not sure.

When you came back was Vaquier in the house?—No, he was out.

Did Vaquier come back later?—Yes.

Did you see him when he came back?—Yes.

What state of mind was he in?—He was very agitated.

Did he say anything to you to let you know what he was agitated about?—Yes, he said something and said he would go.

Mrs Mabel T. Jones

Did you know then that he had asked anybody about you?—No.

By Mr. Justice AVORY—When you say he said something about going, do you mean leaving the hotel?—That is what I took it for. I understood him to say he was leaving. My husband met me across the fields—I am sorry—when I was returning from the fields my husband met me.

Examination continued—You came in with your husband?—Yes, he met me and told me Mr. Vaquier——

You must not tell us what your husband said. You are sure your husband met you?—Yes.

We know your husband was in bed three weeks. Was it after his illness?—Yes.

During the time that your husband had been upstairs, where did Vaquier have his meals?—He had his meals in the bar parlour with me.

Alone?—No, usually with me.

When your husband got better where did he have his meals?—He had his meals with us also, with the exception of when he was busy.

And were you and Vaquier and your husband all on good terms?—Yes, very good terms.

As a matter of fact, did he ever pay you, or, to your knowledge, your husband, for his bill at the Blue Anchor?—He never paid a penny—not to my knowledge.

I want to bring you to the 28th of March. Tell me, first of all, was there a man called George Whitewick, who was manager?—Yes.

Known as George?—Yes, known as George.

Did he at that time sleep in a bungalow in the garden?—Yes.

Was there his wife, Mrs. Whitewick, and did she sleep on the premises?—She only came week-ends.

Was Mrs. Fisher the cook?—Yes.

Did she sleep on the premises?—Yes.

There was a Mrs. Hutley and a man called Vincent, who had a nickname. What was his nickname?—Wag.

About this time do you remember any question about your husband advancing any money to Vaquier?—Vaquier asked my husband for a loan on Friday, the 28th, the day before the death.

Were you present when he asked for that loan?—Yes.

Did you say anything about it?—Yes, I asked my husband not to lend him the money.

By Mr. Justice AVORY—Was any amount mentioned?—No, he simply asked my husband if he would lend him some money, and I persuaded my husband not to do so.

Examination continued—In your presence, or to your knowledge, did your husband ever borrow any money from him?—No.

So far as you know, had Vaquier any large or considerable sum of money available to lend?—I had never seen any.

Evidence for Prosecution.

Mrs Mabel T. Jones

Had any request been made to Vaquier to pay his bill by anybody?—When my husband asked him, he asked if he would wait till he got his money from his patent.

Had he ever made any request to you, not for money, but to do anything?—Who?

Vaquier—did he ever ask you to do anything?—No, only about the hotel, that is all.

By Mr. Justice AVORY—About what date was it that you heard the accused speaking to your husband about payment of his bill?—I could not tell you the date; it was about the same week.

Approximately how long before the death of your husband?—It was the same week as my husband died.

Examination continued—[Shown exhibit No. 19]—This is a document which was found in the possession of Vaquier; it is really a circular of Mr. Schulte's. Look at the back of it. "Why not wait a little while until my business is settled?" In whose handwriting is that?—It is in my handwriting.

Then underneath that something is written in French. Can you understand it or not?—No.

Who wrote what is written in French?—Mr. Vaquier.

I think it will be agreed that what is written in French is a literal translation of the English.

Mr. Justice AVORY—You had better ask the witness which was written first.

Examination continued—Which was written first, the English or the French?—He asked me by the dictionary. I wrote the English.

Then what did Mr. Vaquier do?—I do not know what he did afterwards.

Did you see him write the French?—I saw him write this, yes.

Can you tell me whether he had a dictionary or not?—He had several.

Can you tell me whether he used the dictionary whilst he wrote that or not?—No, I could not tell you.

Will you tell me how did you come to write, and what did you write it for, "Why not wait a little while until my business is settled"?—He asked me to leave my husband.

Was that the only occasion on which he had asked you to leave your husband?—No.

Tell the jury about how many times he had asked you?—I could not tell you; on several occasions.

Can you give me any date approximately when it was this was written on this piece of paper?—No, I could not tell you.

How long or how soon before your husband's death?—I could not tell you.

Where was this written, do you remember?—I believe it was in the bar parlour; I am not quite certain.

Was it whilst Mr. Vaquier was staying at the hotel?—Yes.

Mrs Mabel T. Jones

Where did the piece of pink paper come from?—Out of his pocket.

He had asked you to leave your husband, and you say that you wrote that. Was that by way of being a reply or not?—No; I simply wanted to put him off.

Can you tell me what the next sentence means? First of all, in whose writing is it? "To find pretext for your husband"?—I could not tell you.

Who wrote it?—I could not tell you; it looks like Mr. Vaquier's writing, but I could not tell you.

Is it your writing?—No.

Do you know whose writing it is?—I could not tell you.

When you wrote on this piece of paper "Why not wait a little while till my business is settled," can you tell whether the paper was open or whether it was folded?—No, I could not tell you.

Did you ever see, until you saw it at the Woking Police Court, this, "to find pretext for my husband." Have you ever seen that before?—That I cannot tell you. I do not remember.

On the other side is this, "Purchase of licence for England solely 60,000." That is not in your writing?—No.

Then there is "Schilings" and "Meeting of syndicate of the Pork Shop." That is not in your writing?—No.

Had you ever seen these entries?—Yes, I believe I had.

Do you think they were on the paper when you wrote on it?—That I cannot tell you.

Then also this is on it, "Whos," and then "Who's" with an apostrophe—"Who's master you or I." In whose writing is this?—That is my writing.

Underneath it in French is, "Maitre, vous ou moi"—master you or me. Who wrote, "Maitre, vous ou moi"?—Not I.

Do you know who it was?—The top is not my writing, not the "Whos."

"Who's master you or I," is your writing?—Yes.

How came you to write that?—I think it was over something he wanted his own way; something like that.

Do you know what it was he wanted?—No, I could not tell you; some trivial thing, I believe.

You wrote, "Who's master you or I," and then is written in French, "Master you or I." You cannot help us to what that refers?—No.

Towards the end of your husband's life was he drinking heavily?—Rather heavily, yes.

If your husband took too much to drink, what was his habit the following morning?—He usually took a dose of bromo salts in the morning.

Have you ever seen a bottle of that description in the house at Weybridge?—[Shown blue bottle]—Many times, yes.

With a stopper?—No, not always.

Not always like that?—No.

When there was not a top like that, what sort of top was there on the bottle?—An ordinary sealed cork, a waxed cork.

When was the first time that you ever saw a bottle with a metal top?—About a week before my husband died. We had a bottle in the house about a week.

[At this stage Sir Edward Marshall Hall explained that the original bottle had been analysed and he did not want to undo it, therefore he was using a dummy bottle, an identical bottle.]

[Shown bottle]—Is that the bottle?—That is like the bottle.

By Mr. Justice Avory—It is like what bottle?—The bottle that I handled on the morning of my husband's death, and from which he took the last dose of salts.

The bottle that had been in use for how long before his death?—About a week.

Examination continued—Where does the bottle usually stand?—Usually on the mantelpiece of the bar parlour.

Do any other bottles usually stand on the mantelpiece?—Yes, medicine bottles and other bottles.

You say your husband was in the habit of taking them. Had you ever seen him take them?—Yes, many times.

Can you tell me when he did take them?—He usually took them in the morning.

Would he take them in his bedroom, or in the bar parlour, or where?—Usually in the bar parlour; he usually took them downstairs.

Tell us what the process was?—He usually took them himself. He usually got the water himself and mixed them himself.

He used to get the water himself, mix them himself, and take them himself?—Yes.

Did he take them every morning, or only some mornings?—Only some mornings.

Can you tell me what had generally preceded his taking them?—It was usually after a bad night.

What do you mean by "a bad night"?—After having drunk more than was necessary.

Have you yourself ever taken any of the salts?—For headaches, yes.

Did you ever have any conversation with Mr. Vaquier about bromo salts?—No, not myself.

Do you remember that on the night of Friday, 28th March, there were several people at the Blue Anchor?—Yes.

So far as you can tell us, how many people do you know the names of?—Well, I know the names of Mr. Ross and Mr. Denley, but the other people I cannot remember. I do not know them by name, but I know them by seeing them.

About how many were there there during the evening or on that evening?—I could not tell you exactly.

Jean Pierre Vaquier.

Mrs Mabel T. Jones

What were you doing before ten o'clock?—First of all, I had dinner in the bar parlour. My husband partook of fish. I had partaken of soup first, and then my husband came in and took his fish. Afterwards I returned to the bar and helped in the bar whilst he had his fish. Then I returned to the bar parlour and finished my dinner. After I had finished my dinner I returned to the bar and helped them in the bar until ten o'clock.

May I take it that up to ten o'clock you were in and out of the bar?—Yes.

You stated, I think, that you never spoke to Mr. Vaquier about those salts?—No, not about bromo salts.

Do you know if anybody in the house ever spoke to him about them?—Yes, my husband.

Did you hear what your husband said?—No, only what my husband told me.

We must not have what your husband told you. Did Mr. Vaquier ever tell you what your husband had said to him?—No.

When you gave up serving in the bar did you then go into the bar parlour?—Yes.

You say that was about ten o'clock?—Yes, about ten o'clock.

Did you see Mr. Vaquier in the bar parlour that evening at all?—Yes, he gave me his chair.

What chair was that?—It was an armchair.

Did you sit in the chair?—Yes.

What happened to you?—I went to sleep.

How long do you think you slept in the chair?—I slept until just before twelve o'clock.

When you woke up about how many people were there in the bar?—Mr. Ross and Mr. Denley woke me by coming in; they had been out.

When you woke up was Mr. Vaquier there or not?—No.

What did you do when you woke up?—I woke up and went upstairs. Mr. Ross was on the telephone, and I went into my bedroom to switch on the electric light. There was not a bulb in the mantel, so I went outside and asked Mr. Ross if he would kindly give me a match. He gave me a match, and I lighted the gas fire to see to get into bed.

Did you go to bed?—Yes, I went to bed.

Did you go to sleep?—I went to sleep, and I did not hear anything till the next morning.

Do you remember your husband going to bed that night?—No.

You remember nothing?—No.

What time did you awake?—About twenty minutes to nine.

What woke you?—The woman bringing in the tea.

Who was the woman who brought in the tea?—I believe it was Mrs. Fisher.

When Mrs. Fisher brought in the tea where was your husband?—In bed.

[*Photo. by London News Agency.*

Mrs. Jones.

Evidence for Prosecution.

Mrs Mabel T. Jones

What did you do?—I woke him and offered him a cup of tea, and he immediately got out of bed.

Did he drink the tea or not?—No, he got out of bed first.

What then?—He went outside the room; where he went, of course, I cannot tell you.

How long was he out of the room?—Only a few seconds or a few minutes.

Did he come back?—Yes.

What did he do then?—He got into bed.

Did he drink the tea?—He drank the tea after he came back.

What state of mind was he in?—He was very cheerful.

After he had drunk the tea what did he do?—He simply stayed in bed.

What did you do?—I got up and ordered his hot water.

Did you order the hot water from your room, or where?—No, I went downstairs.

Were you dressed then?—I had my dressing gown on then.

What did you go into?—I went downstairs first. I ordered the hot water from the kitchen, and I went along to the bar parlour.

Was there any one in the bar parlour when you got there?—Yes, Mrs. Whitewick and Mr. Vaquier.

What was Mr. Vaquier doing?—He was sitting in the arm-chair.

Can you tell us what time this was?—I should think about nine o'clock.

What was Mrs. Whitewick doing?—Dusting.

Did you speak to Mr. Vaquier?—Yes, I said "Good morning."

How long do you think you were in the bar parlour?—A few minutes.

After you left the bar parlour where did you go?—Upstairs to the bedroom.

Where was your husband then?—In bed.

What did you begin to do?—I went to dress myself.

Did he remain in bed while you dressed?—Yes.

What about breakfast?—I had breakfast; there was breakfast brought up for two.

Brought up to the bedroom?—Yes.

Do you know who brought it up?—Yes, Mrs Whitewick.

Do you know what time it was?—I should think about a quarter-past ten.

At the time when the breakfast was brought in what was your husband doing?—I think he was dressing.

Did you have breakfast?—Yes, I had breakfast.

Can you tell me whether you had finished dressing before you had your breakfast?—Yes.

Did your husband eat any breakfast?—No.

Did he have anything by way of refreshment at all?—Not whilst I was there.

Mrs Mabel T. Jones

Whilst you had your breakfast where was your husband?—My husband went downstairs.

When you had finished your breakfast where did you go?—I went downstairs into the bar parlour.

By Mr. Justice AVORY—How soon after him did you go down?—As soon as I had finished my breakfast; I could not tell you exactly.

A matter of a few minutes?—A few minutes, I should think.

Examination continued—When you got downstairs did you find your husband?—My husband was in the bar parlour counting his money.

This was a Saturday morning?—Yes.

Was your husband dressed?—He was dressed, with the exception of his collar.

Who was in the room whilst your husband was counting his money?—Mr. Vaquier.

Where was Mr. Vaquier in the room?—He was sitting in the armchair nearest to the door of the bar.

After your husband had counted his money what did he do with it?—My husband gave it to "Wag."

Whilst he gave it to "Wag" was Mr. Vaquier still there?—Yes.

After he had given the money to "Wag" what did he do?—My husband returned to his bedroom, not as I thought to finish his breakfast, but to put his collar on.

Did you go upstairs then?—No, I remained in the bar parlour, by the door.

How long did you stay in the bar parlour?—I could not tell you exactly.

At what time does the bar open?—Half-past ten.

Did you see your husband come downstairs again?—Yes.

About what time?—I should think about twenty-five minutes to eleven.

That was after the bar had opened?—Yes.

Where did he go?—Into the bar.

How long did he stay in the bar?—A few minutes.

Then where did he go next?—He came back to the bar parlour.

Were you there then?—Yes.

Was anybody or anything with you?—I had a dog on my lap.

Was anybody else there?—Yes, Mr. Vaquier.

What chair were you sitting in?—Nearest the door of the bar.

Where was Mr. Vaquier?—Standing by the mantelpiece.

Do not tell me what was said: did your husband make a request to you?—Yes.

As a consequence of that, what did you do?—I went into the bar.

Can you tell me, yes or no, did you see any blue bottle on the mantelpiece at this time?—No.

Evidence for Prosecution.

Mrs Mabel T. Jones

By Mr. Justice Avory—I should like to know what that means. Do you mean you looked and saw it was not there?—No, I did not.

Or do you mean you did not look and did not know?—No, I did not look. I had no occasion to look.

Examination continued—You do not know whether one was there or not?—No.

You went into the bar in consequence of his request. How long did you stay?—Just a few minutes. I said "Good morning" to the customers, and walked back again.

When you came back do you remember what your husband was doing?—Yes, he was playing with the dogs.

After playing with the dogs, what was the next thing he did?—He returned to the table and went straight to the mantelpiece and took a blue bottle from the mantelpiece.

Was it a bottle anything like that?—[shown blue bottle]—Yes.

Having got the bottle, what did he do with it?—He put the bottle on the table and returned to the bar.

Did he come back from the bar?—Yes.

What did he bring with him?—Half a glass of water.

Could you tell by looking at it whether the water was hot or cold?—It was cold.

There was no sign of steam coming from it?—No, because it came from the bar.

Are you able to tell what was in the blue bottle?—No, I cannot tell you.

Can you tell us whether there was anything in it at that time?—There was something in it.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Does that mean that you could see whether it was a full bottle or not?—It was not full.

And you could see that it was not a full bottle?—No.

Examination continued—Could you see how nearly full or how nearly empty it was?—There was not very much in it.

Could you give the jury any idea of about how much there was in it, measuring it in teaspoons?—I could only tell you what there was after my husband had taken the dose.

When your husband took the bottle what did he do?—The first thing he did was to pour a teaspoonful out of the bottle.

Will you explain what you mean by that?—He poured a teaspoonful of whatever was in the bottle into a spoon, and put it into a glass like that [indicating].

Can you say whether what he poured out of the bottle emptied the bottle or not?—It did not empty the bottle.

As your husband put a spoonful of the contents of that bottle into water, what did he do?—He stirred it round vigorously.

As your husband stirred it, as you were describing by your gesture, did he say something?—Yes.

Mr. Justice Avory—You can ask one other question. What was the result of the salts falling into the water?

Mrs Mabel T. Jones

Sir Edward Marshall Hall—I am going to give that, my lord. (*To Witness*)—As a rule, when you put a teaspoonful of those salts into water, what happens?—It fizzes, it effervesces.

Did you notice whether it effervesced when your husband put that into water?—Not directly.

Did you notice whether they began to effervesce before he drank them?—Just a little.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Had you noticed before the way in which it effervesced? Had you ever seen him take it before?—Yes.

Had you noticed the way in which it effervesced on previous occasions?—Yes.

Did it act on this occasion in the usual way or not?—No.

In what way was it different?—There was no foam on the top.

It did not effervesce so much or so quickly?—No.

Examination continued—What did he do with it?—He drank it in one gulp.

Then did he make an exclamation?—Yes.

During the time he had been mixing what he had taken out of this bottle and drinking it, where was Mr. Vaquier?—Sitting in the armchair.

You say he made an exclamation?—Yes.

Mr. Justice Avory—Is that objected to?

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—I am in this difficulty about it, I do not want unnecessarily to take an objection. If your lordship thinks that this can be admitted upon any ground, then, of course, I would not object in any way to it. But my submission to your lordship is, that in the case of a Frenchman who does not understand English at all—the prosecution apparently accept that—the ordinary rule that anything which is said in the presence of the accused becomes evidence does not here apply.

Mr. Justice Avory—There is another view altogether which has to be considered here. It appears to me to be not so much a question of whether the accused heard and understood the exclamation, as whether it may not be evidence on a totally different ground.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—If your lordship thinks so, I will not press it.

Mr. Justice Avory—I should be glad to hear you upon that. It may be evidence in the same way that a complaint by a person as to his symptoms may be evidence, although not made in the presence of the accused person. What is the difference between this and a man making a complaint that he is suffering a pain in a particular place after somebody has assaulted him?

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—This matter was opened by the Attorney-General to the jury, and I did not object to it then. I think I shall have to cross-examine as to this matter, and therefore I withdraw my objection.

Mr. Justice Avory—It is the exclamation which the deceased made at the moment after he drank this?

Sir EDWARD MARSHALL HALL—Yes.

Mr. Justice AVORY—Then I shall admit it.

Examination continued—What was it your husband said as he drank the water?—After having drunk it, he said, "God, it's bitter."

When he said that, what did you do?—I immediately got up from the chair and poured the contents of the bottle out into my hand.

Where were you standing when you did that?—By the table, on the hearthrug.

By Mr. Justice AVORY—Did you say you poured the whole contents out?—Some of the contents.

Examination continued—How near were you to the mantelshelf?—I was not near the mantelshelf at all.

Tell the jury exactly what you found when you poured part of the contents into your hand?—I found instead of bromo salts some long crystals. I tasted them, and they tasted extremely bitter.

How did you taste them?—By wetting my finger and putting the crystals into my mouth.

Was the taste very bitter?—Extremely bitter.

By Mr. Justice AVORY—Do you mean you actually tasted one of the crystals or your finger?—No, I put the crystal into my mouth.

You do not mean you simply tasted it?—No, I put the crystal into my mouth.

Examination continued—Can you give me any idea how much you poured out on to your hand?—I should say not more than a teaspoonful or half a teaspoonful.

Can you tell me how much there was in the bottle if you had poured it all out?—That is what I mean, I poured it out and put it into my hand.

How much did you leave in the bottle when you poured it out on to your hand?—Just a little.

Having poured it out on to your hand and tasted it, what did you do?—I returned it to the bottle.

Will you take the bottle and show the jury what you mean?—I poured it back so [indicating].

Was the gesture you made intentional, when you rubbed your hand on the edge of the bottle?—I just put it so [indicating].

Did you touch the bottle with your hands?—I could not say.

Did you, as far as you know, put it all back?—As far as I know, but I think I must have dropped some.

When you put it back into the bottle where were you standing?—By the table, on the hearthrug.

By Mr. Justice AVORY—Did you say when you tasted those crystals what the result was?—They were extremely bitter.

Examination continued—Have you ever tasted anything like them before?—Never in my life.

Then I think you said something. Do not tell me what it was, but you made a remark?—Yes.

Did you make it aloud?—Yes.

Sir EDWARD MARSHALL HALL—My lord, I understand my friend does not object.

Mr. Justice AVORY—Very well.

Examination continued—What did you say?—I said, "Daddy, they have been tampered with."

Mr. Justice AVORY—I understand you are not objecting to that?

Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—No, I am not objecting, my lord.

By Mr. Justice AVORY—What was the remark?—I said, "Daddy, they have been tampered with; quick, some salt and water."

Examination continued—Then did you go out?—Yes, with the bottle in my hand.

Where did you go to?—I went to the kitchen.

Did anybody go with you?—I believe my husband went with me.

Did you procure some salt and water?—Yes.

Did you give it to your husband?—Yes.

Did your husband take it?—Yes, he drank it.

Do you know what effect it had on him?—Yes, he was sick afterwards.

Was it hot water you got?—Warm water.

Where did you get it from?—From the kitchen.

You say you went out with the bottle in your hand. You mean that blue bottle, I suppose?—Yes.

What did you do with the bottle?—I put it in the dresser drawer.

[Shown photograph No. 7]—Will you just take a pencil and mark which of those drawers you put the bottle in?—*This* drawer at the far end; I cannot get to the far end on this.

Was it nearest the wall or the middle drawer or the nearest drawer?—It was the drawer at the far end.

Mr. Justice AVORY—It is the one on the left hand of the picture, and it is the one shown on the other photograph nearest the wall.

Examination continued—Into what portion of that drawer did you put the bottle?—Right at the back.

Was there anything else in the drawer when you put it in?—Yes, a lot of rubbish.

Was it full or half-full, or what?—Fairly full, I should say—half-full, or something like that.

Did anybody see where you put that bottle?—Yes, Mrs. Fisher. She did not see exactly the place where I put it, but she saw me put it in.

Can you tell me where Vaquier was at that time?—No, I could not.

Evidence for Prosecution.

Mrs Mabel T. Jones

Who put the salt into the water?—I put the salt into the water.

Was that before or after you had put the blue bottle away?—After I had put the blue bottle away.

After having put the salt into the water your husband drank it?—Yes.

Then your husband went out of the room?—Yes.

Did you go after him?—No; I simply changed my shoes.

Did you go anywhere else?—No; I had not the time.

When did you next see your husband?—I saw him in the lavatory being sick.

Can you tell me how long after he had taken the salt and water that was?—About ten minutes, I should think.

Whilst he was in the lavatory, and after he had been sick, did anybody bring him anything?—Yes, Mrs. Whitewick came from upstairs. She came down and told me that my husband was sick, and I went into the lavatory to him. Afterwards she came in and asked should she bring him some tea and common soda.

Did she bring him some tea and soda?—Yes; he drank it and afterwards became numb.

Did he describe what he felt when he drank it?—Yes.

What did he say?—He said he was going numb and cold.

What did you do?—I rushed away and called for help.

Did any one come in answer to your call?—Yes; Mrs. Fisher called George Whitewick, and he helped my husband upstairs.

Then was your husband carried upstairs?—Yes.

Who carried him?—Mrs. Whitewick and George Whitewick.

Did you see anything of Mr. Vaquier at that time?—Yes; he was there the whole time.

Who, in fact, telephoned for the doctor?—I did.

Where is the telephone?—By the bedroom.

Upstairs?—Yes.

When you telephoned to the doctor where was Mr. Vaquier?—As far as I know, he was outside or half-way in the bedroom.

How far from the bedroom door do you think the telephone is?—The telephone is quite near the bedroom door, just outside.

How long was it before the doctor came?—I should say about five minutes.

Before the doctor came had you given your husband anything?—Yes, I had given him salt and water, and also some brandy.

Where was he? On the bed or in the bed?—He was on the bed.

Was he dressed or undressed?—He was dressed.

Will you just give us, as far as you can, the position of his arms?—His arms were at the back of the bed, holding on to the bed.

What about his body?—His body was all drawn.

What about his head?—His head was drawn back with his eyes projecting.

How long was it before the doctor came?—About five minutes.

Mrs Mabel T. Jones

Was that the doctor who had been attending him?—Yes, Dr. Carle.

When the doctor came where was Mr. Vaquier?—He was outside the door, I believe, so far as I can remember.

Where were you?—In the bedroom.

What were you doing?—I was holding my husband in my arms.

You had your husband in your arms when the doctor came?—Yes.

Then did the doctor look after your husband?—Yes.

After the doctor came, and until your husband died, did you leave the room?—Yes.

How often?—I left the room twice.

What did you leave the room for?—To get hot water, at the doctor's request, and a spoon.

Did you get the water?—Yes.

What did you bring it up in?—In a glass.

Now, the first time you went to get the water, did you notice Mr. Vaquier?—Yes; he was outside the room, so far as I can remember.

When you went to get the second glass of water did you see him then?—Yes; he was down in the corridor downstairs.

Did Vaquier say anything to you?—Yes; he said something about my husband having colic.

By Mr. Justice Avory—He simply said colic?—Yes.

Examination continued—Did the doctor ask for something?—Yes.

As a consequence of that, what did you do?—Mrs. Whitewick and I went downstairs to get it.

You and Mrs. Whitewick went downstairs?—Yes.

What did you do when you got downstairs?—I looked for the bottle.

Where did you look for it?—I looked in the drawer where I had put it.

Did you find it?—I found it, but not in the same place.

When you found it, what did you do with it?—Mrs. Whitewick took it from me; I do not know why.

Did you notice either one way or the other what the condition of the bottle was?—No.

Did you go upstairs with Mrs. Whitewick?—Yes; we both went together.

What did Mrs. Whitewick do with the bottle?—She gave it to the doctor.

Mr. Justice Avory—When she says she did not find it in the same place, how different was the place?

Examination continued—You say you did not find it in the same place. Will you please explain what you mean by a different place?—It was not at the back of the drawer where I had put it, but it was in the front of the drawer.

Evidence for Prosecution.

Mrs Mabel T. Jones

When you went upstairs with the bottle and Mrs. Whitewick gave it to the doctor, was your husband alive?—Yes, I think he was, but I am not quite sure; I could not tell you really.

We shall be talking presently about the doctor picking up something: was that before or after he died?—That was after my husband's death.

When you went up to the room and the bottle was given to the doctor, was your husband still alive?—Yes.

How long did you stay in the room?—I was there the whole time until he died.

Did you notice what the doctor did when the bottle was given to him?—I think he poured the water out into his hand.

You think he poured some water out into his hand?—Yes.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Did there appear to be anything but water in it when he handled it?—The doctor said that there was——

Never mind what the doctor said; you saw him pour something out of it. Did there appear to be anything but liquid in it?—I cannot tell you—only the doctor handled it.

You saw him pour some liquid out of it?—Yes.

Examination continued—Where was Mr. Vaquier at that time?—That I cannot say.

The doctor will tell us all about it. Did your husband die?—Yes.

After he was dead did the doctor go downstairs?—No; I believe he sent Mrs. Whitewick downstairs with me.

He sent you and Mrs. Whitewick downstairs?—Yes.

Afterwards did the doctor come downstairs?—When I saw the doctor next I believe he was with a policeman.

What was he doing?—The policeman came in with the doctor.

Was that upstairs or downstairs?—Downstairs.

Later on, or at any time, did the doctor ask you any question about the bottle?—Yes; he asked me——

No, I do not want any more, did he ask you some questions about the bottle?—Yes.

Later on did you see the doctor do something?—In the bar parlour?

Yes, in the bar parlour?—Yes.

What was he doing?—He was picking up the crystals.

He was picking up some crystals?—Yes.

Where from?—From the bar parlour.

What portion of the bar parlour?—Just by the mat, on the rug.

Was that anywhere near the place where you told us just now you had upset some?—Yes.

Can you tell me where Vaquier was when your husband actually died?—No, I could not; but I believe he was downstairs.

Did you see Mr. Vaquier at all that morning after your husband died?—Yes; he was in the bar parlour.

Mrs Mabel T. Jones

About what time was it when your husband died?—I should think about eleven o'clock, but I am not quite sure.

Now, that same evening were you in the bar parlour?—Yes.

Who was with you?—My two children.

Was there anybody else?—Mr. Vaquier.

Did you do anything in the presence of Mr. Vaquier?—Yes.

What was it?—I burnt his photograph.

What photograph was that?—That was the one taken at Biarritz.

That was a photograph similar to the one I showed you this morning?—Yes.

Was that the positive of the photograph you had taken at Biarritz, and which up till then you had kept?—Yes.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Where did you take it from—from your pocket or where?—No; from the mantelpiece.

It was standing on the mantelpiece?—Yes; it was in a packet amongst others.

Examination continued—You took it from the mantelpiece and you burnt it, you say, in his presence?—Yes.

What did he do when you put it into the fire?—He took it from the fire.

Then what did he do?—He returned it to the fire.

He put it back into the fire?—Yes.

Did he say anything in French or in English?—Yes——

In French?—Yes. He made me understand by that that I accused him of murdering my husband.

Was that photograph in fact burned?—Yes.

Now, the next morning was this document brought to you [shown exhibit No. 20]?—Yes, on the Sunday, I believe.

Who brought it to you? Do not say what he or she said?—I believe it was either Mrs. Fisher or Mrs. Whitewick, but I am not quite sure. It was one of the women.

One of the women in the house brought it to you?—Yes.

Do you know the handwriting?—It is Mr. Vaquier's handwriting.

Sir Edward Marshall Hall—It is in a mixture of French and English.

The Clerk of Assize—The document says: "Madame Jones, Your gesture of to burn my photographie to have meaning whom you to accuse me of the misfortune who me to crush. To make attention you whom through of falsehood and for to make happy of other to make to go in prison."

Sir Edward Marshall Hall—The word "me" is struck out. It is "me to make to go in prison."

The Clerk of Assize—Yes.

Examination continued—I think he stayed at the Blue Anchor some time, did he not?—Yes.

At the time you received that letter, except for throwing the photograph into the fire, and the inference he drew from it, had you made any accusation against Mr. Vaquier?—No; not so far as I know.

Before he left the Blue Anchor did you make any accusation against him?—Yes.

Will you tell us first of all how soon after your husband's death that was?—It was, I believe, on the Wednesday or Thursday.

By Mr. Justice AVORY—The following Wednesday or Thursday?—Yes.

Do you know which day it was he actually left?—No; I think it was on a Thursday.

Was the accusation made the same day or the day before he left?—I believe it was the day before.

Examination continued—Before you made this accusation had he said anything about going?—No, not that I remember.

Or had he made any action as if he was going?—I believe it was on the Sunday.

That was the Sunday after the death of your husband?—Yes.

What happened on the Sunday?—I believe he took his bag, but I was not there, so I cannot say.

On this Thursday what did you say to him?—I accused him of killing my husband. I said, "You have killed my husband."

By Mr. Justice AVORY—You spoke to him in English?—Yes.

Will you try and use the exact words?—I said, "You have assassinated Mr. Jones."

Examination continued—Did he reply?—Yes.

In English or in French?—In English.

What did he say?—He said, "Yes, Mabs, for you."

What did you say to that?—I said, "I would have killed you if I knew you would have done a thing like that."

[Shown exhibit No. 21]—Was that handed to you on the very day that he left?—Yes.

Is it in Mr. Vaquier's handwriting?—Yes.

That has on it "Blue Anchor Hotel, Byfleet." Is that printed?—Yes; that is printed.

It says, "Madame Jones, Your solicitor to come here to-day morning. Love him much. Adieu for ever"——

The CLERK OF ASSIZE—There is something scratched out there.

Sir EDWARD MARSHALL HALL—The jury can see it for themselves. I will not attempt to interpret it. It says, "Love him much," and then there is something struck out, then "Adieu for ever." That document may become important. (*To Witness*)—Now, have you seen Mr. Vaquier since he left the Blue Anchor until you saw him at Woking?—No.

Can you tell me whether there had been any conversation between you and your husband in Vaquier's presence as to selling the Blue Anchor?—Yes.

Mrs Mabel T. Jones

Had Mr. Vaquier made any suggestion as to what you should do if the Blue Anchor was sold?—Yes; he wanted my husband and I to go abroad.

By Mr. Justice Avory—With regard to exhibit No. 21, I do not follow what happened. Was that handed to you by the accused, or was it brought by some one else?—It was brought by some one else.

That was on the day he left?—Yes.

Cross-examined by Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—I have, altogether, given evidence upon three occasions now. First, before the Justice at Woking, where I was cross-examined; then before the Coroner, where I was not cross-examined; and finally to-day. I was first asked by the police to make a statement on the day of my husband's death. I made a statement that day in the coffee-room of the hotel. It was Superintendent Boshier who asked me the questions. He questioned me both after my husband's death and in the evening; I saw him twice that day. I could not tell when I next made a statement to the police. I do not think the police asked me for any other statement, but I could not be sure. I may have made a statement on the Sunday; but I would not be sure.

Is there any other statement that you made to the police?—No, only at the Public Prosecutor's office.

I am going to ask you about that; but was there any other statement made by you at all to the police?—The police did not come at all to ask me, so I could not make a statement.

Did you go to see the police?—No.

Did you make any other statement to the police, either at the Blue Anchor or the police station, after 30th March?—No, I did not.

The accused was arrested, as I daresay you know, on 19th April?—I could not tell you the date.

He was arrested on 19th April, and was the next statement of any sort that you made after 30th March made when you were taken to the Director of Public Prosecutions office in London?—That is so.

That was on 29th April, ten days after the accused was arrested?—Yes.

I want to know a little about that visit to the office of the Director of Public Prosecutions. In the evening you had been warned to be at the police station next morning?—My man warned me; I had a message over the telephone.

Do you mean George?—Yes; he warned me that I was to be at the police station the next morning. I was warned on the 28th that I was to be there on the morning of the 29th. I went to the police station the following morning; the police sent a car for me. I should think it would be about nine o'clock, but I could not tell exactly. I was taken to the police station at Woking by, I presume, a police officer. Mrs. Fisher also went with me. When we got to the police station we saw some policemen, but I do not know who

they were; I do not know any of them. I saw Mr. Boshier afterwards.

How soon afterwards?—I could not tell you.

I want you to think a little?—I am sorry, but I cannot say.

Was it about a quarter of an hour after you got there, or two hours, or what?—It was not two hours, but I could not say exactly. I could not say whether it was a quarter of an hour or twenty minutes—not to be sure.

Did you make any statement to him?—No.

How long were you kept at the police station?—That I could not tell you.

Should I be right in saying it was two or three hours?—No; I could not tell you. I can tell you how long I was kept on the day, but not at the police station.

It was a very important matter to you, was it not—a very important day to you?—But why me?

Was it not important? Was not this day when you were being taken to the Director of Public Prosecutions office a very important day?—It may have been important, but not to me.

You realised, did you not, that you were going to the office of the Director of Public Prosecutions for the purpose of making some statement about the death of your husband?—No; I did not know where I was going. I knew I was going to an office in town, but where I could not tell you.

Were you not the night before, when you had warning to go to the police station, nervous that you were going to be arrested the next morning?—I! Why? No. Why should I be nervous?

You are sure of that, are you?—Positively, absolutely.

When you finally left the police station you were not told where you were going to, but to an office in London?—I was going to an office in London, I understood. I may have misunderstood the officer, but I understood that I was going to an office in London.

What did you understand was going to happen to you when you left the police station at Woking?—That I was going to an office in London.

That is, you say, all you understood?—Yes.

If that was all you understood, did you ask anybody to what office you were going to be taken in London?—No.

Who went with you?—Superintendent Boshier and Mrs. Fisher, and the other superintendent—I forget his name.

Two police officers, you and Mrs. Fisher?—Yes.

Do you remember at all what time it was when you got to the office in London?—No, I could not tell you.

Have you no idea?—No; I could not tell you the time.

You do not know whether it was twelve o'clock, or two o'clock, or three o'clock?—I should say it was about midday.

You would say so?—Yes, I should say so.

On the way up to London, which is some distance away from Woking, did either of the police officers sit inside with you?—Yes.

By Mr. Justice AVORY—You went by motor car, not by train?—Yes.

Cross-examination continued—I knew the name of the officer who was inside with me, but I cannot remember his name now.

Was it Kenward?—Yes, Kenward.

Was it a silent journey?—Yes; it was very silent.

Still no questions as to where you were going, or why you were being taken?—No; I did not ask any questions.

You tell the jury that nothing was told you on the way up from Woking as to why you were going to London, and where you were going?—I did not ask any questions, so I did not expect a reply.

Did Mrs. Fisher ask any questions?—No; I do not think so.

Not in your presence?—No; I do not think so.

Arriving at the office, how did you find out it was the office of the Director of Public Prosecutions you had gone to?—By the notice on the door.

Now, not having made any statement at all to the police from 30th March, at any rate, and possibly not since the 29th, you realised then, upon 29th April, that it was a matter of great importance your being taken to the office of the Director of Public Prosecutions?—I do not know that I did. I did not take it very serious.

Do you really tell me that?—Yes; I do really tell you that.

When you got to the Director's office, did you go with the two police officers into some room?—No; I went into the hall first and waited there, and I was afterwards taken into the Public Prosecutor's office by Superintendent Boshier.

How long did you sit in that office?—I should think about ten hours.

Did you say, "I should think about ten hours"?—Yes.

Were you being interviewed all that time?—I had a luncheon hour, but afterwards I was being interviewed the whole of the time.

I just want to get it quite clear from you—I am not binding you, of course, to half an hour one way or the other—but do you say that you were being interviewed at the office of the Director of Public Prosecutions for something like nine hours that day?—Yes.

You began to realise then that it was an important matter, I should think?—Well, I simply told them what I knew; I could not tell them any more.

Were you telling them what you knew for nine hours?—Yes.

How many people were in the room whilst this interview was going on?—Part of the time there were three and myself.

Somebody asking questions?—Yes; and another person taking it down.

Somebody was writing it down?—Yes; and another person prompting.

How?—Giving notes.

Giving notes to your interrogator?—Yes.

In that way, somebody asking the questions, somebody prompting him, and somebody else taking it down, a statement was taken from you?—That is correct.

Were you then finally conveyed back to Byfleet?—Yes.

In the middle of the night?—No, not in the middle of the night.

Not in the middle of the night, perhaps, but in the late evening?—Yes.

Now, after that nine hours' interview, were you seen again at all by the police before you gave evidence?—No; I do not think so.

You gave evidence, we know, for the first time, upon 12th May. You may take that date from me?—Yes.

I want to ask you a question or two about your different businesses before I come to the other matters, because you have been asked about them by Sir Edward. Have you told us all the businesses you were interested in at Kingston or not?—To-day?

Yes, to-day?—I do not think I have been asked about all of them.

Then I will ask you. Did you have a business which was called the Old English Café?—Yes.

When did you take that?—I took that in 1915.

Until what time?—Until 1923.

Did you employ people there?—Yes; numerous people at that time.

At that café was there a room which was known as the blue room?—Do you mean at the Old English Café or The Chalet?

I was only asking about the Old English Café?—It was The Chalet before.

Was there a blue room at the Old English Café?—Yes.

You are quite right; it was suggested to you before as being The Chalet. You did not volunteer then that a mistake was being made, that it was the Old English café?—No. Why should I.

Was that a café at which sometimes you used to sleep and remain for a night?—Not sometimes; I lived there for a period from 1915 to the beginning of 1923.

By Mr. Justice Avory—You lived there?—Yes.

Cross-examination continued—Were you actually living there during all that time?—Yes.

Since the beginning of 1923 have you slept there?—Yes.

Often?—No.

How often?—I should think I slept there at the beginning of 1923.

Since the beginning?—Oh, I should say two or three times.

Mrs Mabel T. Jones

I am including all 1923, from the time you yourself lived there?—It all depends, you see. If you can give me an idea——

I will try and make it clear. From the time when you ceased to live there how many times have you slept there?—I did not cease to live there permanently; I did not cease to sleep there permanently; I only took diggings.

Where were they?—In Weybridge.

After you took diggings in Weybridge did you sometimes go and sleep in this blue room at the Old English café?—Not in the blue room; that was the office that you are talking about now.

In some bedroom?—In the bedroom.

Is it not right to say that, after you gave up living there permanently, there was no bedroom upon the premises?—The bedroom was there.

But it was not furnished?—Well, I should say the room was furnished until August.

Then up till August it was furnished?—Yes.

In August was the only place in which to sleep upon the premises the blue room, upon the settee?—I do not know; I have not slept there.

I put it to you definitely: did not you sleep there at all?—No.

Do not answer the question until I have put the date to you. Did not you sleep there in fact in August of last year?—No, I did not.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Let us clear this matter up. You say you did sleep there once or twice in 1923?—Yes.

In what months?—I could not tell you the months; it was just when I wanted to go down and look after the business, and stay the night, and take the things back to Brooklands.

Was it before August?—I should say probably it was, but I could not tell you. You see after we left there on 13th August I did not sleep there.

Cross-examination continued—After what date?—After 13th August.

Did you sleep there early in August last year?—I should think probably I did—with my husband.

You add "with my husband"?—Yes.

Just think. Do you say that you slept with your husband at that café at the beginning of August?—Yes.

Were you driving over in a motor car?—Yes; I had a car of my own.

Was there a man of the name of Alec?—Not in the car.

Do you know a man named Alec?—Yes; I have an odd man named Alec.

Who drove the car?—Well, we had two. Which car do you refer to?

I do not mind a bit which car, but had you got a man named Alec who drove one of your cars?—He drove the Ford van; I do not know about a car.

The "Blue Anchor," Byfleet.

Evidence for Prosecution.

Mrs Mabel T. Jones

Did he drive you over to Kingston from Weybridge?—When was that?

In August last year?—I could not tell you whether it was August.

Did he drive you at some time about that time from Weybridge?—I could not tell you. It may have been about that time.

I do not want to mention the name unless it becomes necessary, but did he drive you over with a gentleman who was then acting as your solicitor?—No, certainly not.

When was that business sold?—Which business? The Old English Café?

Yes?—It was taken out of my hands in November.

Was that owing to the bankruptcy impending?—That was when I signed the deed of assignment.

Now, the Blue Anchor was in fact purchased with your money, was it not?—No.

Was it purchased with £500 which you had paid your husband by way of wages?—It was with my husband's wages that he purchased the Blue Anchor, or part of his wages.

Did you pay him in a lump sum £500?—I did.

Where did the other £800 come from?—I could not tell you.

You really do not know at all?—I do not know.

There was a sum of £800 missing in your bankruptcy, was there not?—I could not tell you.

Just think?—There was nothing missing in my bankruptcy. I explained everything to the Bankruptcy Court.

That is why I am asking you about it. It may be a coincidence, but was there in fact a sum of £800 missing?—Not that I am aware of.

Did they allege that there was?—I do not think so.

Really! When you came to the end of last year you knew, did you not, that your bankruptcy was imminent, and that a receiving order was likely to be issued any day?—At what date was this?

The end of last year?—Yes, after November.

After November you knew that was the position?—Yes.

How many days before the receiving order was issued did you leave this country?—I could not tell you. I went away by the doctor's orders.

I am going to ask you about that. But you cannot tell me how many days it was before?—No; I could not tell you.

Was it three or four?—I could not tell you.

You have no idea at all?—I am sorry; but I could not tell you

We know—at least I think we do, and my learned friend will correct me if I am wrong—that you went away upon the 8th or the 9th of January. Did you know then that, within a day or two, there was going to be a receiving order issued?—No, not within a day or two; I did not know.

Mrs Mabel T. Jones

Did you know that within a week or ten days there would be a receiving order?—I am sorry; but at the time I was very ill.

Mr. Justice AVORY—I thought we had already had the answer that after November she knew her bankruptcy was impending.

Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—Yes.

Mr. Justice AVORY—Is not that enough for you?

Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—If your lordship pleases. (*To Witness*)—At any rate, you went away on the 9th?—Yes, on the doctor's orders.

Sir EDWARD MARSHALL HALL—It was on the 7th. She got a passport on the 5th and left London on the 7th.

Cross-examination continued—Very well. You say it was on your doctor's advice?—Yes.

Who was your doctor?—Dr. Carle.

Did anybody else advise you?—Yes.

Who else advised you to leave and go?—Not actually to leave.

Who else advised you to go away?—The solicitor.

I do not wish there to be any misunderstanding. It is not the solicitor who is instructing my learned friend now?—No.

Had the man who was then your solicitor been acting as your solicitor for long?—He had been my husband's solicitor. He acted in my bankruptcy.

How long had you known him? I have known him for some time; I should say about two years.

He was a very great friend, was he not, and visited you constantly?—He was a friend of my husband's.

Did you give that answer, Mrs. Jones, to try and make the distinction that he was not a friend of yours?—No; I am not trying to make any distinction at all.

Was he a friend of yours?—He was a friend of my husband; he was more my husband's friend than my own.

Was he a friend of yours?—I say that he was more my husband's friend than mine.

We will see. Now, you went out to Biarritz, and you went to the Hotel Victoria?—Yes.

That is a very good hotel at Biarritz, is it not?—Yes.

When you were at the Hotel Victoria at Biarritz were you paying your bill, or was it upon some inclusive ticket?—An inclusive ticket.

A ticket which took you out and boarded you and brought you back again?—Yes, but I paid extras.

Yes, I daresay; but that was the way you were staying at that hotel?—Yes.

For how long was the ticket available, providing board and lodging?—Seventeen days, I believe.

At the Hotel Victoria, as we know, you met the accused, Mr. Vaquier?—Yes.

He was employed there, was he not?—I could not tell you his business; I knew that he worked the wireless.

He was what?—He was an operator there; that is all.

I suggest to you that he was employed there as the wireless operator?—I could not tell you whether he was employed there or not.

At any rate, he looked after the wireless?—Yes.

How long did you know him before you went away from Biarritz to Lourdes and Pau?—I think I was at the hotel for about four or five days.

Did you say much to him during that time or not?—I saw him the whole time I was there.

All day?—No.

That is what I mean; during those four or five days did you see much of him or not?—I usually went out for walks on my own.

By Mr. Justice Avory—You mean by that that you went by yourself?—Yes, by myself.

Cross-examination continued—I only want to know—and there ought to be no difficulty in telling me—did you see him much during those four or five days?—In the evenings.

What, sitting in the lounge, or something of that sort?—No; he used to go up and operate the wireless.

Did you see him by yourself, privately?—We used to go out for walks occasionally.

And you conducted your conversation, such as it was, through a dictionary?—Yes.

It was quite apparent then that he did not understand any English at all?—I do not think he did. I am not quite sure whether he understood it or not, but he did not understand it so far as I was concerned.

You say that he did not understand English so far as you were concerned. Is that right?—Yes; he used to talk by means of the dictionary.

When you went away from Biarritz to go to Lourdes and Pau, was it arranged that you were going to return to Biarritz?—I think I said I would, if possible, return to Biarritz.

Would this be a fair way of putting it: you promised him, if possible, to return to Biarritz?—Yes.

Had you told him then that you were in fact a bankrupt?—No, not until afterwards.

By Mr. Justice Avory—About when did you first tell him that?—It was when I returned to Biarritz.

Cross-examination continued—Now, when you returned to Biarritz, did your ticket still include board and lodging at the Hotel Victoria?—No.

Did you go back to that same hotel where he was wireless operating?—Yes, for a week.

By Mr. Justice Avory—The ticket had then expired, had it?—Yes.

Mrs Mabel T. Jones

Cross-examination continued—At that time was Vaquier living at the Hotel Victoria as well?—Yes; he was there when I arrived.

And when you came back?—Yes; that is what I mean.

Did he go on living there for the few days you were living there?—I could not tell you how long it was; I was there about a week, I think.

I do not mind how long it was, but he was living there so long as you were there?—Yes, until he asked me to leave.

You are not suggesting to the jury, are you, that you did not know perfectly well when you left the Hotel Victoria that you were going to live with Mr. Vaquier at the Hotel Bayonne?—I am not suggesting; I am just telling the truth.

Then I would like to know what you say about that. Did you not know perfectly well when you left the Hotel Victoria that you were going to live with the prisoner at the Hotel Bayonne?—No.

Mr. Justice Avory—You mean in the full sense?

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—I mean in the full sense of the word. (*To Witness*)—You really say that, do you?—Yes.

Had you booked any room for yourself when you left the Hotel Victoria to go to the Hotel Bayonne?—No; I had not booked any room, and I had not left the Hotel Victoria at the time I stayed at the Hotel Bayonne.

Did you go to the Hotel Bayonne for dinner?—Yes.

Did you not go there because you were told that it was a cheaper hotel?—That is correct.

Had you been told that by the prisoner?—Yes.

Did not you know quite well when you went to dine at the Hotel Bayonne that you were going to stay there because it was cheaper?—Mr. Vaquier was going to book me a room there because it was cheaper.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Is this right, that you understood, before you left the Hotel Victoria, that the prisoner was going to book you a room at the Hotel Bayonne?—Yes; he booked it over the dinner table, as a matter of fact.

Cross-examination continued—Booking it over the dinner table, did you understand that he was booking a double room?—No.

When did you realise that it was a double room?—When I went up to the room.

Did you come down again, or did you stay?—I stayed.

You stayed there, as we know, for eight days?—I could not tell you how long it was.

Well, we know that by the bill; it was from 28th January to 4th February. It was eight days, if you include them both, and seven days otherwise. Now, had the prisoner by that time left the Hotel Victoria? Of course, he had left it from the point of view of sleeping there, but had he left it so far as being the wireless operator was concerned, or not?—I could not tell you.

Living with this man for seven or eight days, do you know whether he was still acting as wireless operator at the Hotel Vic-

toria or not?—I could not tell you whether he was going back there or not.

You do not know whether he was working there during that time?—He did not go back in the evenings.

You know he was not working there?—He was not working at the time I was there.

Now, from Biarritz you went to Bordeaux. Is that right?—Yes.

And from Bordeaux to Paris?—Yes.

Whilst at Paris had you been going out with the prisoner to a place called Sens?—Yes.

In relation to this invention of his that he wanted to sell?—Yes.

It is not very important, but I suggest to you that all the expenses at that time were being paid by the prisoner—in Paris and at Bordeaux?—Oh, no.

Leaving France upon 8th February, you knew quite well that this man you had met in this way was coming to England in a day or so, did you not?—I knew he was coming to England, yes.

And upon 12th February you had this telegram. I do not want to go through it again, but you had the telegram telephoned to you, with the result that you went to the Hotel Russell?—That is so.

That night, 12th February, your husband would have been at Byfleet?—Yes, he was there.

You knew he was going away the following day?—No.

Did you arrange to meet the prisoner the following day?—Yes.

To lunch on the 13th?—Yes.

You say that you did not know that your husband was going away, but in fact did he go away that following day, the 13th?—He was not sure whether he was going away or not, not even on the 13th. He went away on the 13th, but I did not know where he was going at the time.

Now, on that night when you missed the train, do you suggest that you were taken by surprise when you were taken to this man's room?—Yes, because I asked him to book me a room.

That is really your suggestion?—It is not my suggestion; it is the truth.

On the 14th he came down to Byfleet, you have told us, and I suggest to you that that was by arrangement with you?—It was no arrangement at all.

Upon arrival at Byfleet, do you remember that it was Mrs. Hutley who let him in?—I could not tell you. One of the women let him in, but I could not tell you which one.

I suggest that Mr. Hutley came to you and told you that a Frenchman had come to see you, and that you took him at once upstairs and remained up there some time with him?—I could

not tell you how long I was upstairs. I was in the lounge, as a matter of fact.

Would that be correct?—I could not tell you; I was upstairs.

Had he not come by arrangement?—No.

I suggest that he in fact stayed there from then until after your husband's death?—Yes; he asked if he might do so.

Except for the 3rd March, did you ever have connection with him after 13th February?—No.

It would be correct, therefore, for him to say that he had never had connection with you here, in a statement made at Byfleet?—That would be correct.

From the 17th February you have told us that your husband was in bed, or was not well, for about three weeks?—Yes.

During that time you were looking after him and sleeping in his room?—Yes, I was looking after my husband night and day.

In your husband's room?—Yes.

Were you visited every Sunday by the man that I have mentioned, the solicitor who was then acting for you?—No.

Did he not come to the hotel every Sunday?—I do not think he came every Sunday.

Did he come practically every Sunday?—No.

By Mr. Justice Avory—When you say, "my solicitor," there may be some confusion with somebody else. There was only one person acting as solicitor for you prior to your husband's death?—Yes.

Cross-examination continued—Besides being your solicitor, was not that gentleman your lover?—Never.

Did you know, or had you been told, that he, the solicitor, had told your husband that he loved you?—No; I do not think so.

You do not think so?—No; I am sure not.

I am putting this quite seriously to you, because I am going to suggest a conversation about it. Is it not correct that you were told by your husband, or by somebody else—by your husband, I suggest—that the solicitor had said that he was in love with you?—No.

I suggest, as the result, that not unnaturally there was trouble between you and your husband?—Never.

Did not the prisoner speak to you about this matter?—No.

During the whole of the time the prisoner was at the Blue Anchor did he and your husband appear to be on very good terms indeed?—Yes.

As a matter of fact, do you not know that the prisoner had arranged with your husband to take a hotel at St. Jean de Luz?—He spoke about it, but I do not know that any arrangement was made.

It had been seriously discussed, at any rate?—Not so far as I know—not seriously discussed, but it had been discussed.

You can draw the distinction between "discussed" and "seriously discussed" if you like. Had it not gone as far as

the prisoner actually telling you the name of the villa that you were to take, the Villa Merien?—Not that we were to take. He told us the name of the place.

Did he tell you that the place was to let? Was that the suggested hotel?—Yes, his suggestion.

Were the plans of that villa shown?—Yes; he drew them, but he was not asked to do so.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Who was not asked to do what?—Mr. Vaquier was not asked to draw the plans.

You mean it was he who introduced the subject?—Yes.

What was the suggestion—that you were all three to go?—Yes.

Cross-examination continued—It was he who suggested it?—Yes.

And the plans of this villa, to which the prisoner was suggesting the three of you should come, were only shown by the prisoner the day before your husband's death, were they not?—That I could not say; I do not think so.

Just think?—It was not the day before my husband's death.

Will you swear that?—Yes; I will swear that.

Was it the day before that?—I could not tell you—within a day or two.

Within a day or two of your husband's death?—Yes, within a day or two.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Was this to be carried on as a hotel or not?—I believe so; it was a hotel and restaurant.

As a hotel and restaurant, but was it an existing hotel?—That I could not tell you.

It never got as far as that?—No.

Was it at St. Jean de Luz?—I believe that was the name of the place.

Cross-examination continued—It was near Biarritz?—Yes.

You told me that, as far as you could say, on both sides your husband and Vaquier were on good terms?—Yes, as far as I could see.

Unfortunately, for some time past your husband had been drinking very heavily?—Yes; my husband had been drinking heavily.

Had you been drinking heavily too?—No, I had not. I am not in the habit of drinking heavily.

That is a different thing. Were you from time to time also drinking at night?—No, never.

You used sometimes to take the bromo salts in the morning?—I never took them regularly. I have taken them once or twice in my life for headaches.

Would it be correct, as I suggest you said before the Justices, that you took them occasionally?—I took them for headaches occasionally.

Headaches in the morning?—No, not necessarily in the morning; I have taken them in the afternoon.

Mrs Mabel T. Jones

Did you know that Vaquier, or, at any rate, did he say that he was a very bad sleeper?—Yes, the last fortnight.

When you say, "the last fortnight," do you mean he told you during the last fortnight that he had been a bad sleeper all the time, or that he was only sleeping badly for the last fortnight?—He was only sleeping badly for the last fortnight.

I suggest he told you that he was always a bad sleeper?—No.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Did he give you any reason for sleeping badly for the last fortnight?—He simply said he was worried over his patent, at not getting his money.

Cross-examination continued—Now, I suggest to you that it was long before the last fortnight, and that as far back as 1st March he told you that he was a very bad sleeper and was going to get something for it?—No; I do not think so.

You say you do not think so?—No, he did not.

At any rate, you knew, did you not, that he came down very early in the morning?—Well, he told me that he came down, but I did not know.

Did you never make inquiries from the maids or from the other employees of the hotel?—He was down before them.

Then you could have asked them, when they came down, whether they found him there?—It was not necessary; I was not interested.

The answer is that you did not?—No.

You hardly ever came down yourself, did you, until about ten or half-past ten?—Probably nine o'clock and sometimes ten o'clock; it all depends.

I want to know, because we are going to have some other witnesses from the hotel. I suggest to you that, with very rare exceptions, you never came down yourself until about ten or half-past ten?—It all depends upon what we had to do. Whilst I was there, sometimes I would be up at seven, sometimes at nine, sometimes at ten, and sometimes half-past. I had no regular time.

I am sure you can understand my question when I put it in this way. Was it your usual habit to come down between 10 and 10.30?—Whilst I had business with Brooklands I used to come down early, but afterwards, no.

I am not bothering a bit about a year ago or even three months ago. I want to know whether I am right in suggesting that between the time you returned from Biarritz, about the middle of February, up till the end of March, you almost always came down between ten and half-past ten?—Sometimes it was nine o'clock, sometimes it was ten, and sometimes half-past. I had not any regular hours.

On this night before your husband's death, the 28th March, apparently there were a number of people at your hotel who were drinking heavily?—I could not say whether they were drinking heavily or not, because I slept the most part of the time.

With all these people sitting and drinking with your husband you were able to sleep there, through any noise they might be making?—They were not making any noise, otherwise I should not have slept.

How many were there sitting there with your husband drinking —five or six?—There may have been, but they must have been quietly talking, otherwise I should have woke up.

We shall hear from them what the condition of affairs was. At any rate, you slept during that evening from ten until twelve o'clock?—No; from after ten until just before twelve. It was just before twelve that I woke up.

You were drinking, were you not?—I beg your pardon, I was not drinking.

Were there about forty glasses on the table when you woke up about twelve o'clock and went to bed?—I could not say there were forty; I could not tell you how many. There were a few glasses on the table, but I could not say how many, as I did not count them.

There is a difference between a few and forty. I suggest there were forty?—I would not like to make a suggestion that there were forty.

You would not like to swear that there were not?—I should not say that there were forty on the table.

Were there thirty?—No, I could not say.

At this hotel did you not have frequent parties and dancing? —My husband had parties.

Well, parties at which you were present?—Not always, no.

I will put the same question as I put it before, usually present? —No, not usually present.

Present once or twice a week?—No.

Where were you when these dances went on?—I usually went to bed, because I was an invalid.

While I am upon it, I suggest to you that after your husband's death these dances went on, and that you were present and danced? —Dances did not go on.

Were there not reporters staying in your hotel?—Reporters may have stayed there, but dances were not going on.

Did not you dance with them?—I did not. My two children and the reporters may have danced, but myself, no.

You swear you did not?—Yes; I swear I did not.

I have got now the visitors' book from which exhibit No. 17 has been taken out. Have you seen this book?—I have seen it since it has been in Court.

Mr. Justice Avory—What is the relevance of this?

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—I am putting it on the suggestion as to the way in which this hotel was being carried on before the 29th March.

Mr. Justice Avory—I am asking what is the relevance of the way in which it was carried on?

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—I am attacking this lady's credit absolutely, in every way.

Mr. Justice Avory—All I say is that I cannot see how the way in which this house was carried on under the direction of her husband can affect her credit as a witness.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—Of course I am suggesting, as I have now done, that this was in fact her hotel and bought with her money.

Mr. Justice Avory—Very well; you had better put a few more questions on that point as to whether she had the management, directed the management, or had any control.

Cross-examination continued—Owing to the way in which your husband was drinking about this time, were you not really managing this hotel?—I was not managing the hotel; I had not any interest in the hotel.

I do not mean by that calling yourself manager. I mean actually managing the hotel?—No; I was not actually managing the hotel.

Who looked after the hotel for the three weeks your husband was in bed?—Mr. Whitewick.

What, the barman?—Yes, he was the manager.

You call him the manager, but was he not really the barman?—Not a real barman.

Was there any other barman?—He was a working manager. It was not a large hotel where you had to have a large staff, and during my husband's illness I do not think we had any parties there at all.

If you tell me that you have never seen this book, I will not put the entries to you. Do you say you have never seen it, except in Court?—No, I have not seen it, except in Court.

Mr. Justice Avory—Which is that?

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—The visitors' book.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Where was it kept?—It was usually kept upstairs.

Where—in the lounge?—Yes, that is where it was found.

I want to clear up this question of the visitors' book. When you say it was a book kept in the lounge, do you mean it was a book in which persons who stayed at the hotel were required to sign their names and addresses, or was it one of those what I may call complimentary visitors' books, in which people may write their names when they leave?—I could not tell you; I have had no interest in the hotel at all.

You have had nothing to do with it?—No.

Cross-examination continued—But did not you ask the prisoner to sign it?—Yes.

Why did you do that if you had nothing to do with it?—Because my husband was away then.

But why not this man who you say was the manager?—I cannot tell you why he did not ask him to sign it.

You knew perfectly well that anybody who came to the hotel was asked to sign the visitors' book, and that is why, when your husband was away, you asked the prisoner to sign it?—I did not know that everybody signed the book, but I asked the prisoner to sign it.

Now, you have told me that your husband used to take the bromo salts after he had been drinking too much overnight, and that sometimes when you had a headache you would take some. Was there anybody else in the hotel who took them?—My husband introduced them, but I do not know who took them.

Your husband introduced them?—He used to introduce them to his friends.

Your husband used to give them to some of his friends who came in, did not he?—That I could not tell you.

By Mr. Justice Avory—You mean he recommended them?—Yes.

Cross-examination continued—In the house your husband sometimes took from the bottle, and sometimes you. Was there anybody else?—Sometimes his friends.

From that bottle?—Yes.

That is what I thought. Some of the friends who did not feel too well would take them?—I could not tell you whether they felt well or not, but he used to give them.

This bottle was kept, in the ordinary way, upon the mantelpiece in the bar parlour?—Yes.

Where anybody could go to?—Yes; anybody could get to it.

Do you know, or do you not know, whether it had been brought out the night before and put upon the table amongst the glasses where that party was that you went to sleep through?—I did not see it there; I cannot tell you.

You are not prepared to say one way or the other?—No.

Do you know that the prisoner went to bed on that night of 28th March about 10.30?—I could not tell you; I was not awake.

Having been to sleep for nearly two hours, you went up to bed, and you slept solidly until you woke the next morning, not even hearing your husband come into bed with you?—That is so.

And that is because you were tired?—Yes; I had been working.

The next morning you say that you went downstairs to order the hot water?—Yes.

Did you ever go downstairs to order hot water except upon that morning?—Yes.

When?—I could not tell you when, but if ever my husband was in a hurry I usually went down myself.

I want you to be more careful about this. As a matter of fact, I suggest to you that you never went downstairs in the ordinary way to order the hot water?—I should not suggest that if I were you; it is not true.

And I suggest that upon this particular morning you did not order any hot water?—I did order hot water.

From whom?—I ordered it from Mrs. Fisher.

Was there a bell in your room?—Yes; there was a bell in my room.

Next to the bed?—I have to get out of bed and go round the other side.

At any rate, there is a bell in the room?—Yes; there is a bell in the room.

Next to your bedroom, which was bedroom No. 7 on the plan, was there a bathroom?—Yes; there is a bathroom.

With hot and cold water laid on?—Not exactly hot and cold water.

Then I will split that question up. Is there hot and cold water laid on?—Yes; it is laid on.

Is there not always hot water to be obtained in that bathroom next to your bedroom?—No.

Is there not always hot water by nine o'clock?—No.

How often would there be no hot water by nine o'clock?—Well, I could not tell you how often, because I have not tried it.

I must ask you to tell me, because I am suggesting that there was always hot water by nine o'clock?—No; there was not always hot water by nine o'clock.

Once a month was there not?—That I could not tell you.

I want to press you about this. You say you went downstairs that morning for the purpose of ordering hot water. I suggest, first of all, that there was a bell in your room, and, secondly, that next door you could have obtained hot water?—No.

Did you go to see whether it was hot?—No; I did not think about the bathroom, not for shaving.

Not hot water for shaving?—Would you allow me to explain why I went downstairs to order the hot water?

Certainly, you are entitled to explain?—I went downstairs to order the water because my staff are not any too smart in answering the bell, or bringing things up quickly.

I have suggested the bell in your room, and I have suggested the bathroom next door. Now, by going just out of your room and leaning over the banisters Mrs. Fisher would be below in the kitchen, would she not?—She may have been.

That is where the servants' apartments are?—Yes.

When you say "my staff," you mean your husband's staff, I suppose?—Yes.

I thought you had made a mistake. But you went downstairs, you say?—Yes.

When you went downstairs, and after you say you ordered hot water from Mrs. Fisher, did you go to the bar parlour?—Yes.

Why?—I usually have a look along the bar parlour if I go downstairs.

Evidence for Prosecution.

Mrs Mabel T. Jones

I am suggesting, you know, that you hardly ever go downstairs before 10 to 10.30?—Oh, yes, I do.

Having ordered the hot water, at any rate, you did go to the bar parlour?—Yes.

How long were you down there?—A few minutes.

Then you went back again to your bedroom?—Yes.

Then had breakfast?—Yes.

Of which your husband had none at all?—No; he did not eat anything.

After breakfast did you go downstairs again?—Yes.

What was that for?—I used to go downstairs after our breakfast.

But you were not dressed?—Yes; after I had had breakfast I was dressed.

The Court adjourned.

Second Day—Thursday, 3rd July, 1924.

Mrs. Mabel Theresa Jones, cross-examination by Sir Henry Curtis Bennett *continued*—Can you tell about what time it was that you went downstairs for the purpose of ordering the hot water?—As far as I can remember about nine o'clock.

I understand the reason that you went down to order it was that you were in a hurry for it?—My husband was in a hurry for it.

How soon did it come?—A few minutes afterwards.

Do you remember in what it was brought up?—Yes, in a hot-water can.

And I assume only one lot of hot water?—Yes.

When you went down again about half-past ten you were fully dressed, were you?—Yes.

When you went down did you find your husband counting up the money?—Yes; he was sitting in the bar parlour counting the money.

Was Vaquier there, too?—Yes; in the armchair.

Did you not know that Vaquier said that he had lent your husband some money?—No; I did not know of that until after my husband's death.

Do you remember Vaquier writing you a letter two or three days before your husband's death, which he sent you by one of the servants?—No; I do not remember any letter.

I suggest to you that you knew before your husband's death that Vaquier said that he had lent your husband money, and he told you that he had asked it back on at least two occasions?—Vaquier had never made that statement to me.

Did he make that statement to you, according to you, after your husband's death?—After my husband's death was the first I heard of it. I heard it from Vaquier.

I am suggesting that that was before your husband's death; you say it was after. Did you say when he told you he had lent your husband money, that he had no right to do that as your husband was always borrowing money?—I told him it was a lie.

By Mr. Justice Avory—I do not know which was a lie?—That he had ever lent my husband money.

Cross-examination continued—Had your husband borrowed considerable sums from other people?—My husband's business I knew very little about.

Perhaps you can answer that even if you knew little about his business. Had your husband borrowed considerable sums from other people?—That I do not know; I cannot answer to be correct.

Neither one way nor the other?—Neither one way nor the other.

Was there a doctor at Brooklands from whom he had borrowed a large sum of money?—Not that I am aware of.

You knew nothing about it?—No. I do not know of a doctor at Brooklands.

Of course, you had a catering contract for Brooklands, had not you?—Yes, but I do not know of a doctor at Brooklands.

I suppose a great number of doctors go to Brooklands?—I cannot tell you.

At any rate, you do not know?—I do not know.

How many bottles were kept upon the mantelpiece in the bar parlour?—It all depends on how many were in use.

What is the greatest number that you have known?—I could not tell you; I have never counted.

You have no idea?—I would not say, one, two, or three.

Would you say four, five, or six?—No.

No idea?—No.

Was the bottle of bromo salts always kept on the mantelpiece, or was it sometimes upon that bureau at the side?—It was usually kept on the mantelpiece.

That rather implies what I am asking. It was sometimes kept elsewhere, but usually kept on the mantelpiece?—Usually kept on the mantelpiece.

On an average how long did a bottle of these bromo salts last?—I could not tell you that.

We will try and see if we can find out. The time that a bottle would last must vary according to the number of people who have taken doses out of it. Should I be right in suggesting to you that there was a new bottle about once a week?—No.

Once a fortnight?—No, I should not suggest it if I were you, because I cannot give you a correct answer.

Do you tell me you have no idea how often a new bottle of these bromo salts was bought?—I cannot tell you, not to tell the truth.

No idea?—I could not tell you, to tell the truth.

You would be prepared to deny, on an average, a bottle a week?—No, I should not deny anything.

When your husband went to take the dose of bromo salts upon the morning of the 29th, had he been to get his glass of water before he took the bottle off the mantelpiece?—I believe he took the bottle off the mantelpiece first; I am not sure.

Would it be right to say that you noticed your husband go to the bar and get first a glass of water—he had a spoon—and he got the bromo salts from the mantelpiece. Is that the right order?—It may be so.

The water which he got in the glass would come from the bar, would it?—Yes.

Do you know what the dose of these bromo salts is?—A teaspoonful, I believe.

"A heaped teaspoonful in half a glass of water. Repeat in half an hour until relieved, or until three doses are taken. It is not often that the second or third dose is required." That is what it says on the bottle. Was your husband in the habit of taking a large teaspoonful?—He usually took a teaspoonful.

In that bottle that morning, when you saw it, how much do you think there was?—I could not tell you the exact amount; I could only tell you the exact amount which was left, or approximately the amount that was left in the bottle.

Was it about two teaspoonfuls?—I should say so.

Mr. Justice Avory—Do you mean after?

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—No, before—when he took down the bottle.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Before your husband helped himself to it there were about two teaspoonfuls?—I should say so. I did not know at the time.

Cross-examination continued—So it follows he took about half?—He took a teaspoonful; that is all I know.

You told me that other people in the house, you thought, had had the salts on occasions. Did you know Vaquier had taken the salts upon some occasions?—I had not seen him; I was only told.

You were told by whom?—I was told by my husband.

In the usual way these salts fizz considerably, do they not?—Yes.

When your husband had put about a teaspoonful into this glass of water he said, "These damn things won't fizz"?—Correct.

Did they fizz at all, did you notice?—Just a little.

Do you mean by that there was just effervescence, or that there was real fizzing at the top of the amount of liquid in the glass?—I did not examine them closely; I was sitting on a chair.

You did notice slight fizzing?—Slight fizzing, yes.

Then he said, "Oh, God, they are bitter." Were you sitting down in the room at that time?—Yes; I was sitting in the armchair with the dog in my lap.

And you poured out or put into your hand some of the remaining stuff which was in the bottle?—Yes.

About half a teaspoonful?—I did not measure them.

About that?—No; I do not suppose it was as much as that; I should not say so.

Would not this be right, that you emptied the bottle into your hand, about half a teaspoonful?—It may be.

I was not there; I want to get from you, if I can, about how much you think it was?—I do not think I said I put half a teaspoonful into my hand.

Would it be right to say that you tasted them by moistening your finger, placing it upon the salts, and then on to your tongue?—Yes.

The Bar-parlour.

Evidence for Prosecution.

Mrs Mabel T. Jones

I may be wrong, but I thought you said yesterday, in answer to my lord, that you took one of the crystals and put that crystal into your mouth?—I moistened my finger and put the crystal or crystals into my mouth.

You agree with me it would be correct to say, "I tasted them by moistening my finger, placing it on the salts, and then on my tongue"?—Yes.

Did you notice that they tasted bitter?—Extremely so.

You at once said, did you not, "These have been tampered with"?—I did.

At once?—Yes.

Directly after your husband had taken the dose did he go to the window and spit outside?—I do not think so.

Just think?—No; I do not think so.

I suggest to you it would be the natural thing to do, having swallowed something, which was very bitter, that he went to the window and spat outside?—It is not a window, it is a door, so I do not know how he could get to the window.

Do you say there is no window in the bar parlour?—No, it is a door; you have to open a door.

Call it whatever you like: did he spit outside?—I could not tell you.

You do not know one way or the other?—No.

Did you immediately spit out the little that you put into your mouth?—Naturally, yes.

It would be the natural thing to do?—Yes; it was bitter.

I agree. Whereabouts were you standing?—I was standing on the mat or the hearthrug.

Between the table and the fireplace?—Yes.

Did you not, standing in that position, throw the little amount in your hand into the fireplace?—I did nothing of the kind.

I suggest you did that, and as you did it Vaquier said, "Pardon, madam, dear"?—You will excuse me, I did not do that sort of thing. How could I throw them into the fire and return them to the bottle at the same time?

I suggest you did not return them to the bottle?—Oh, I did.

I suggest you threw what was in your hand into the fireplace?—I returned them to the bottle.

Did Vaquier say——?—He did not speak.

He did not speak at all?—No.

Whilst whatever it was that you put out of the bottle on to your hand was upon your hand, do you say that you noticed long transparent crystals?—Yes.

Have you ever seen pure strychnine?—I did not know what strychnine was; I have never seen strychnine before.

I am putting that in distinction from hydrochloride of strychnine—whether you had ever seen pure strychnine?—I have never seen poison of that description, or any poisons.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Do you know anything about the difference between pure strychnine and hydrochloride of strychnine?—I know nothing about poisons at all.

Cross-examination continued—What was on your hand you describe as long transparent crystals?—Yes.

Did you put upon your hand any bromo salts?—Yes.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Do you mean in addition to the crystals?—Yes.

Cross-examination continued—I do not know whether you can tell me—about half and half, or more of one than the other?—More crystals than bromo salts.

Having moistened your finger and taken something out of the palm of your hand, did you find when you, as you say, went to put it back into the bottle that some of it stuck to your hand?—No.

You were able, according to you, just to empty it back into the bottle like that [indicating]; it was not necessary to scrape it off?—No; I do not think so.

Then you called for salt and water, did you not?—Yes.

Did you go yourself to the kitchen?—I did.

With the bottle still in your hand?—Yes.

Did your husband go to the lavatory?—My husband followed me, as far as I can remember, into the kitchen, and I gave him the salt and water.

When he had taken the salt and water did he then go to the lavatory?—I do not know where he went.

Did he leave you?—He left me, yes.

Do you say you do not know where he went to?—No; I did not follow him.

Do not you know now where he went to?—I believe he went into the bar parlour, and I believe he then returned to the lavatory.

By Mr. Justice Avory—The question is where you next saw him?—Where I next saw him was in the lavatory.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—I rather wanted to get whether he went from where he got the salt and water, which I understand was either in the kitchen or just outside, straight to the lavatory, or whether he went back to the bar parlour first.

By Mr. Justice Avory—You do not know?—I do not know.

Cross-examination continued—You heard him being very sick in the lavatory, did you not?—I was informed that my husband was being sick in the lavatory.

Informed by whom?—By Mrs. Whitewick.

After your husband had taken the salt and water—and you, of course, had the bottle with you and had gone to the kitchen—when did you put the bottle, according to you, in the drawer?—I put the bottle in the drawer before I gave my husband the salt and water.

Evidence for Prosecution.

Mrs Mabel T. Jones

After your husband had gone away after taking the salt and water did you remain on in the kitchen?—Yes; I changed my bedroom slippers to my shoes.

Did you realise then that your husband was ill?—My husband was not ill at the time.

Not to your knowledge?—He was not ill at the time I changed my shoes.

Was it not directly after you say you changed your shoes in the kitchen that you heard from Mrs. Whitewick that he was being sick in the lavatory?—After I changed my shoes, yes.

It was the next thing that happened?—Yes.

The lavatory in which he was being sick was the lavatory which is a little beyond the entrance to the kitchen?—It was downstairs, anyway.

You know it, don't you?—Yes; I know it.

Was not it this one [indicating on plan the lavatory beyond the entrance to the kitchen]?—Yes; that is right.

It is the only one downstairs?—No; there is another one outside.

Outside, I agree, but it is the only inside lavatory?—The only inside one, yes.

Can you give us any idea, after you were told by Mrs. Whitewick that your husband was being sick in the lavatory, how long he remained in the lavatory being sick?—I could not tell you how long. I went straight to him when she told me he was sick.

Did he remain there for a minute or two being sick after you got there?—He was being sick, and I put my hand on his head, and I said, "Have you brought it up, darling?" He said, "Yes." I said, "Now you will be all right."

He had then a cup of tea with some soda in it?—Mrs. Whitewick suggested she should get some tea with some soda.

Did he have some?—Yes; he took it.

Then he was carried upstairs?—No; he said he became numb and cold, and he walked along the passage, and was afterwards carried upstairs.

Did Vaquier assist to carry him upstairs?—I think it was Mrs. Whitewick and Mr. Whitewick.

Would not it be right to say, "George Whitewick, Mrs. Whitewick, and the accused carried my husband upstairs"?—Probably so; I do not remember whether he carried him upstairs or not. I believe he was assisting at first, and Mrs. Whitewick took him afterwards.

Did you telephone yourself for the doctor?—Yes.

The doctor wanted some water, did he not?—He asked for some hot water and a spoon.

Are you quite clear about this? Did you go downstairs for the hot water yourself?—Yes.

More than once?—I went for the first lot, and when he asked for the second lot I went also for it.

You went twice?—Yes.

Did you go down either or both of those times by yourself or not?—I went down by myself.

Both times?—Yes.

To the kitchen?—I went to the bar to get the glass, and back to the kitchen to get the water.

Where would you get the hot water from in the kitchen?—Mrs. Fisher poured it into the glass for me from a kettle.

Do I understand you to say when you went to fetch the second glass of water you saw the accused?—Yes.

Then he said something about colic?—Yes; that is correct.

The doctor asked for the bottle?—Yes.

And you went to fetch it?—Yes.

When you went down to fetch the bottle did you go alone or not?—No.

Who went with you?—Mrs. Whitewick.

Did you take it up again to the bedroom?—Mrs. Whitewick took it up. I went with her.

You say that you found that bottle in a different position?—Yes; it was in the front of the drawer and not the back.

Were there other things in that drawer?—Yes; papers, rubbish.

When you went to fetch the bottle and found it, and you say it was lying in front of the drawer, was it lying on the top of the papers or was it underneath?—It must have been underneath, otherwise I should have seen it when I first opened the drawer.

Then it was underneath?—Yes.

You did not notice, did you, the condition of the inside of the bottle?—I did not look.

And you did not notice?—No.

When the doctor came down, after your husband's death, did he come to the bar parlour?—I believe the doctor went first for the policeman.

Did he eventually go to the bar parlour?—Yes.

Did both you and he pick up something from the floor?—I did not pick up any crystals from the floor.

You say you did not pick up anything from the floor. Is that correct?—That is correct.

You answered that by saying, "No crystals." You picked up nothing?—No.

The next incident you speak of is the evening of that day, is it not?—As far as I can remember, I believe it is.

As far as you can remember, did you have any conversation with Vaquier until the evening?—I do not think so.

Right up to 29th March, if you and Vaquier desired to have conversation, did you still carry on by the help of a dictionary?—Yes, sometimes, and sometimes by word of mouth.

And sometimes by putting a word down or a sentence down

in English, and he translating it from the dictionary into French, or *vice versa*?—Yes.

During that day, the 29th, and before you had the conversation with Vaquier in the evening, had you thrown anything away out of your purse?—Nothing out of my purse, no.

Had you thrown anything away?—No, nothing out of my purse.

I am not putting it "out of your purse" now. Had you thrown anything away?—Only a photograph, in the evening, on the fire.

I do not wish there to be any misunderstanding about this. Between the time when your husband died and the time when you say you threw Vaquier's photograph on to the fire in the evening, had you thrown anything else away?—I had not.

Had you a small photograph of Vaquier?—Not then.

In addition to the one thrown on the fire?—Not then.

Had you had one?—I had had one, yes.

Up till when?—I could not tell you; up to some time before my husband's death.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Was it another print of the same?—No; it was just a small photograph—a passport photograph.

Cross-examination continued—Did you carry that small photograph, when you had it, about with you?—It was usually in my bag.

You mean your handbag?—Yes.

When did you get rid of that photograph?—Some long time ago.

By Mr. Justice Avory—When you say, "some long time ago," do you mean long before the death?—Yes.

Cross-examination continued—I do not want there to be any misunderstanding about this. Are you quite sure that you had got rid of that small photograph, which you were in the habit of carrying in your bag, a long time before your husband's death?—Yes.

A week or a fortnight?—I could not tell you the exact time.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Do you remember how you got rid of it?—Yes, I burned it.

Cross-examination continued—You did not put it down the lavatory?—No.

When you say you threw this photograph upon the fire in the evening, would you tell us what it was that Vaquier said?—Yes; something about "By that gesture you accuse me of the death of your husband," or "the murder of your husband"—something similar to that.

You may not be able to do so, but, if you can, I want you to tell exactly what he said—not what you understood him to say, but what he actually said?—No; I cannot tell you exactly.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Did he say it in broken English or partly in French and partly in English?—He made me understand.

Mrs Mabel T. Jones

Cross-examination continued—What I suggest he was trying to make you understand was, what had you done that for?—No; I do not think so.

Upon the following morning you got the note brought to you by Mrs. Hutley, which is exhibit No. 20?—One of the women; I am not quite sure of the name.

I read exhibit No. 20 again: "Madam Jones, your gesture of to burn my photographie to have meaning whom you to accuse me of the misfortune who me to crush. To make attention you, whom through of falsehood and for to make happy of other to make to go in prison." That is it, is it?—This is the note, yes.

That was the next morning?—I believe on Sunday morning, yes.

Did you speak to Vaquier about that note at all or not?—I could not tell you.

You do not know one way or the other?—I could not tell you whether I spoke to him or not; I do not believe I did.

Upon that Sunday, the day after the death of your husband, did your solicitor call?—Yes; as a matter of fact, he called on the Saturday afternoon.

He called on the afternoon of the day of the death, do you mean?—That is so.

Did you see him to talk to him upon that Saturday afternoon?—I spoke to him; I told him my husband was dead.

How long was he there that Saturday afternoon?—Not very long. He had brought some friends.

Was he in the habit of coming on Saturdays: was it not usually on Sundays that he came?—I do not know whether he had any habit of coming regularly or not.

I suggest he had the habit of coming every Sunday?—No; he did not have the habit of coming every Sunday.

Then, on the Sunday, what time was it that he came?—I could not tell you the time; I do not know whether it was in the morning or afternoon.

Did you say upon that night to Vaquier that you wanted him to leave on the Sunday night?—My father-in-law did, not myself.

Did you say it?—No.

Did your father-in-law say it in your presence?—No.

He told you that he had said it, did he?—Yes.

Can you remember when it was that Vaquier told you that he had lent your husband some money? You say it was after the death?—Yes; I am not quite sure whether it was Tuesday or Wednesday.

Did you say you did not understand what he was talking about quite, and suggest an interpreter?—He sent for an interpreter; he asked me to wire, and I wired for him, and he came, and this is what I knew from the interpreter.

You wired for an interpreter?—For Vaquier.

So that Vaquier should talk to you?—So that Vaquier could tell me what he wanted to say.

Did the interpreter in fact come?—Yes.

That was Mr. Schulte?—Yes.

Did Vaquier, through an interpreter, ask you to look to see whether there was a receipt in existence for his money?—That is so.

Did you say you would like to see if any receipt had been made out?—I told him I would not listen to lies.

Did you not say you would look to see if there was any receipt written out?—No; I do not think so. I may have done; I would not be sure.

That was on the Tuesday or Wednesday?—One day that week.

It was on the Thursday that he left, the 3rd April. Was it that day or the day before that you say there was the conversation when you said that he had assassinated Mr. Jones?—I believe it was the day before.

Was the conversation, which you allege took place then, carried on through a dictionary or not?—When do you mean.

What I am asking you about is the Wednesday when you say you said to him that he had assassinated Mr. Jones?—No; by word of mouth.

The interpreter having been brought down on the Monday or Tuesday about the money matter, this conversation was carried on without an interpreter or a dictionary. Is that right?—It was a conversation in which I accused him.

What did you say?—I simply said, "You assassinated Mr. Jones."

Was anybody there?—No.

Then he answered you, you say, in English?—Yes.

Then you spoke again to him in English: "I would have killed you if I had thought that you would do a thing like that"?—That is so.

Did you know that when Vaquier went up to London on the Thursday, the 3rd, he was going for the purpose of going to the French hotel?—No; I did not.

It was upon that day, was it, that you got exhibit No. 21 [shown exhibit No. 21]?—Yes; that is the day.

"Madam Jones. Your solicitor to come her to-day morning. Love him much. Adieu for ever"?—That is right.

Did you understand that?—Yes; I could understand this.

Did you understand it when you got it?—I did not know what it meant, only I was told that he had gone in the early hours of the morning.

That he had gone and had left that note for you?—Yes; I believe it was on the kitchen table—the woman said it was on the kitchen table.

There is one other question I ought to put to you about the Villa Merien, St. Jean de Luz. I asked you whether plans had been discussed and shown you about this villa?—Yes.

Mrs Mabel T. Jones

I want to put it quite definitely to you: I suggest that the plans were plans which had been drawn out by Vaquier?—I believe so, yes.

Were they not brought up to your room by your hushand on the morning before his death?—No.

When?—I had seen the plans downstairs; they were never brought to my room.

Was it the day before your husband's death?—I could not tell you. I do not think so.

Can you tell me when it was?—No; I cannot.

There are only one or two other matters. I am putting these questions out of the statements, which, of course, are not yet proved. Is it the fact that upon one occasion shortly before your husband's death you returned your wedding ring to him?—No; I never returned my wedding ring to my husband.

Have you ever said you would?—No.

Mr. Justice AVORY—When do you suggest that that was done.

Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—The exact date I do not know, but about a fortnight before the husband's death. (*To Witness*, shown exhibit No. 19)—The last entry which was referred to upon that is in your handwriting, is it: "Who's master, you or I?"?—Yes, that is so; it is in my handwriting, with the exception of one word at the top, "Who's."

I understood you to say the first "Who's" is not in your handwriting?—No.

"Who's master, you or I?" is in your handwriting?—Yes; it is.

Did that truly represent the condition of affairs between you and Vaquier, that if you could not have your way you would write, "Who's master, you or I?"?—No. It was he who wanted his way, not me.

He wanted to have his own way?—Yes.

He wanted to have his own way about some small matter, you say?—Yes.

Your answer to that was "Who's master, you or I?"?—Yes.

Re-examined by the ATTORNEY-GENERAL—With regard to your visit to the Public Prosecutor's office on the 29th April, you told us you went in a car, and that a police officer was inside the car with you?—Yes.

Did anybody else sit inside the car with you?—Yes; Mrs. Fisher.

Did Mrs. Fisher go with you to the Director's office?—Yes.

When you were in the office were you examined by this gentleman sitting in front of me?—Yes.

Did any one else ask you any questions except this gentleman?—No; I do not think so. I am not quite certain. I will not be clear on that; I do not think so. This gentleman asked me questions the whole time.

Evidence for Prosecution.

Mrs Mabel T. Jones

Who else was in the room?—Superintendent Boshier and the gentleman who took down the shorthand notes and myself.

The inspector and a shorthand writer?—Yes.

And this gentleman here?—Yes.

At the conclusion of your examination were you shown a transcript of what had happened?—Yes.

And did you initial it and sign it?—Yes.

Were there a great number of pages of typewriting?—Yes; there were.

And did you leave the statement at the office of the Director?—Yes.

While you were being questioned by this gentleman who is sitting in front of me, do you know where Mrs. Fisher was?—No; I could not tell you.

When you left the Director's office, how did you travel back to Byfleet?—By car.

And who travelled back with you?—Mrs. Fisher, Superintendent Boshier, and a superintendent.

The same officers who came with you and Mrs. Fisher went back with you?—Yes.

There is one other topic I want to touch upon and that is the matter of the hot water, about which you have been asked a question. How is the water heated in your bathroom?—By fire in the kitchen.

Is the kitchen fire kept in all night or not?—No.

Can you tell the jury until the fire is lighted in the morning is the water in the bath hot or not?—Usually cold.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Some time after the fire is lighted I suppose it is hot?—Yes.

Re-examination continued—Do you find the water in the bathroom next to your bedroom is hot very early in the morning?—No.

What did you want the hot water for on this particular morning?—It was for my husband; he was to go to Kingston.

What did he want the water for?—For shaving and washing.

Was it usual or unusual that hot water should be required in your bedroom as early as that?—No; it was not unusual.

On occasions when the hot water was required as early as that where did it come from, as a rule?—From the kettle.

Was there anything unusual in your going down to the kitchen to get the hot water when it was wanted as early as that?—Nothing at all.

[At this stage the plans referred to in the evidence with regard to the Villa Merien, St. Jean de Luz, were produced by the Attorney-General, who explained that they were drawn up on two pages of the Byfleet Hotel paper, the first page bearing a description of the accommodation in the Villa (written in French) and the second page containing a sketch of the use to which the Villa could be put as a hotel. The plans were marked exhibit No. 42.]

Mrs Elizabeth M. Fisher

Mrs. Elizabeth Mary Fisher, examined by Mr. Roome—I am a widow, and I reside at 186 Acre Road, Kingston. Since September of last year I have been cook at the Blue Anchor Hotel at Byfleet, and I have been sleeping in the house. I remember Mrs. Jones returning from France. Shortly after her return I remember Mr. Jones going to Margate. The day Mr. Jones went to Margate Mrs. Jones went up to London. She did not come back that night. The next day was my half-holiday. I got back that night with the quarter-past nine bus. I saw Mrs. Jones then. She came into the coffee-room with a Frenchman whom I had not seen her with before. He was the accused. He had not brought any luggage with him. His luggage came about three days after. I remember Mr. Jones returning from Margate on the Sunday. He was very ill and he went to bed, and he was in his room for a fortnight or so.

During the time that Mr. Jones was upstairs in his bedroom ill what was the conduct of the accused and Mrs. Jones that you noticed?—I did not notice anything. Of course, Mrs. Jones used to be in the bar parlour, and I was always in the kitchen.

How did the accused behave towards Mrs. Jones?—Well, he followed her about all over the place, and they went out together for walks, but I did not notice anything else.

Did you notice anything with regard to the meals?—Yes; they were very long over their meals, and he would not have a meal without Mrs. Jones. I remember Friday night, 28th March, I went to bed at 10.15. I got up the next morning at 7.15. When I came down to the kitchen I found the accused there.

What was he doing?—He just had some coffee which was cold overnight. The potman came in next, and after him came Mr. Whitewick, the manager. The potman's name is William Vincent; he is sometimes called "Wag." He did not sleep in the house. As I have already said, the manager, George Whitewick, came in after the potman, and Mrs. Whitewick came in a little later. Mrs. Whitewick had been sleeping that night in the bungalow with her husband. There was also a young man named Ross sleeping in the hotel at that time. He came down about half-past seven. I gave him a cup of tea and he went away. That was before eight o'clock. There was also another visitor, Mr. Denley, who slept in the hotel. He came down about a quarter to eight and left about eight. I took morning tea up to Mr. and Mrs. Jones about twenty minutes to nine that morning. When I came down again I noticed that the accused was in the coffee-room. There is a gas fire in the coffee-room.

Did the accused remain there or go anywhere else?—I went down to the bar parlour to do the fire, and he followed me immediately down behind me. I started to do the fireplace, and the accused came down and sat in the armchair with his overcoat over him round his shoulders. There was a fire in the kitchen at that

time. That was the place where I had first seen the accused. When I saw him sitting in the armchair with his overcoat round him, I asked him why he did not sit in the coffee-room by the fire, that he would be smothered with dust where he was. There was a gas fire in the coffee-room. I spoke to him in English; I do not speak French. He remained sitting there and did not answer me.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Did he appear to understand what you said to him at all?—He may not have done.

Did he give any sign showing he did not understand you?—No; he simply sat quite still.

He took no notice?—He took no notice.

When you said, "Why do you not go to the coffee-room," did you point or indicate what you meant?—Yes; I pointed like that (indicating).

You pointed towards the coffee-room?—Towards the coffee-room.

Examination continued—On any other morning, at that time of day, had you ever seen him sitting in the bar parlour?—You see it was not my work in the bar parlour, only the housemaid was away that week-end; I had never done the bar parlour on other mornings; I was in the kitchen.

Did you notice where the accused usually sat at that time in the morning?—In the dining-room—in the coffee-room he usually used to sit. There was usually a fire in the coffee-room. I used to light it at first in the morning, then he got into the way of lighting it, seeing me do it. It was only the last fortnight he took to getting up so early.

By Mr. Justice Avory—When you say "the last fortnight" you mean the last fortnight before the death?—Yes.

Examination continued—On the morning I have just spoken of I raked out the ashes in the bar parlour and lit the fire. I did not sweep the room, as I had too much to do that morning; I just swept the pieces off the hearthrug and then left the room. Mr. Jones came into the bar parlour while I was there, and I spoke to him about the accused sitting there in the dust. I spoke to him in front of the accused.

By Mr. Justice Avory—About what time was it Mr. Jones came down?—Just about nine o'clock, I think, not very long after the tea went up.

Examination continued—What was it you said to Mr. Jones?—I said——

Mr. Justice Avory—Stay. This is objected to. I cannot admit it without proof that the accused understood.

Examination continued—In consequence of what you said to Mr. Jones did he say something to the accused?—Yes, in French; Mr. Jones could speak French.

After Mr. Jones spoke in French to the accused, what happened?—He followed Mr. Jones half-way up the passage. Mr.

Jones went upstairs, and he immediately came back and sat down again. I opened the door and he shut it.

By Mr. Justice Avory—How far did the accused follow him, do you say?—Almost to the foot of the staircase.

He followed the deceased Mr. Jones to the foot of the staircase. Mr. Jones went upstairs and the accused returned to the bar parlour, is that right?—Yes. Then I opened the door into the yard to let the dust out, and he immediately shut it and sat down again.

Examination continued—I went into the kitchen after that. I was in the kitchen until I took the hot water upstairs. It would be about twenty-past nine when the hot water went up, and Mrs. Whitewick took the breakfast up at about twenty to ten.

Before you went up with the hot water had you seen Mrs. Jones?—I took the hot water up the stairs, and as I came down and was going back into the kitchen I saw Mrs. Jones coming from the bar parlour in her dressing-gown. She then went upstairs. I next saw Mr. Jones just after ten when he came down. He was going to Kingston himself to the bank, but he altered his mind and was going to send the potman. Later on in the morning Mr. Jones went into the yard with me. He was fully dressed at that time, with his collar and tie on. It must have been getting on towards eleven, I should think, by that time. I looked at some curtains that were drying on a line in the yard. After that I saw Mr. Jones go back to the bar parlour; at least he went back that way. He went along the passage towards the bar parlour. I went into the kitchen. I did not stay very long in the kitchen; I was all over the place at that time. I never saw Mrs. Jones again until she came for the salt and water. She asked for some salt and water, and I got the water and Mrs. Jones put the salt in. She came from the direction of the bar parlour. I did not see anything in her hand then, but later on I did when she came back.

By Mr. Justice Avory—You mean she took the salt and water into the bar parlour?—Yes.

Examination continued—Then do you say she came back?—Yes.

Did you notice anything this time in her hand?—She had something in her hand like that (indicating); I could just see the top of the bottle. As near as I could see it looked blue.

Did you see the accused?—Yes.

Where was he?—Just outside the kitchen door.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Do you mean he was standing, or what?—Standing just outside the kitchen door. The kitchen door was open.

Examination continued—What did Mrs. Jones do with the bottle?—Put it in the kitchen drawer, the end drawer in the dresser.

Evidence for Prosecution.

Mrs Elizabeth M. Fisher

Do not tell us what she said, but did she say something to you as she did that?—Yes.

From where the accused stood could he see where Mrs. Jones went to in the kitchen?—I do not know whether he could see; of course, he could hear the drawer.

By Mr. Justice AVORY—You say "he could hear the drawer": do you mean hear the drawer being opened?—Being opened, yes.

Examination continued—Did you hear any one being sick?—Yes; Mr. Jones, in the lavatory. I remember Mrs. Whitewick making some tea. She put some common soda in it and took it towards the lavatory. I did not see anything of Mr. Jones until they brought him out of the lavatory.

Who brought him out?—The Frenchman had him underneath his arms, and Mrs. Whitewick had hold of his legs first.

Did you fetch Mr. Whitewick from the bar to help to carry him?—Yes. I went into the bar until Mr. Whitewick came back, and then I went back to the kitchen.

By Mr. Justice AVORY—When Mr. Whitewick came did he take the place of the accused in carrying Mr. Jones?—No; he took his legs because he was too heavy for Mrs. Whitewick.

Did you see who carried him upstairs, in fact?—No; I did not see that, because I was down in the bar.

Examination continued—After you got back to the kitchen from the bar what was the next thing that happened in the kitchen?—I was in the scullery then, cleaning the scullery, and the accused came downstairs and asked me for the bottle—medicine—for the doctor.

By Mr. Justice AVORY—You were in the scullery?—I was in the scullery.

The accused came into the scullery?—He came as far as the scullery door.

Examination continued—From the kitchen as far as the door of the scullery?—Yes.

By Mr. Justice AVORY—What did he say?—"Medicine—doctor—quick."

Examination continued—He said that in English?—Yes; but not quite so plain speaking as I am speaking.

Besides saying that did he do anything to explain his meaning?—Yes, he took a salts bottle from the dresser shelf which belonged to Mr. Whitewick—kruschen salts, I think. That was to get me to understand what he wanted. Of course, I knew then.

What did he do with it?—He showed it to me to tell me what he wanted.

By Mr. Justice AVORY—Was that in the kitchen?—I was in the scullery.

You say he took the bottle from the dresser—the dresser in the kitchen, you mean?—Yes.

What sort of a bottle was that?—It was a kruschen salts bottle.

Mrs Elizabeth M. Fisher

Examination continued—What did he do with Mr. Whitewick's bottle after showing it to you?—Put it on the shelf again—or it was on there when I went into the kitchen, so I suppose he did.

He put it back?—Yes.

Then what did you do?—I pointed to the kitchen drawer and told him where it was—the dresser drawer.

Which one?—The end one.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Was that the one which you had seen Mrs. Jones put the other bottle in?—Yes.

Examination continued—When you pointed that drawer out to him did you see what he did?—He went straight away round to the drawer and opened it.

Did you look to see anything more?—No; I went on with my work.

What did the accused do?—He went out of the kitchen again.

By Mr. Justice Avory—In which direction?—I could not tell you in which direction.

Did you actually see him leave the kitchen?—I saw him go through the kitchen door; I was doing the scullery step.

Examination continued—I went on cleaning the scullery step; I was kneeling from the inside. My back was to the kitchen door.

Your back being to the kitchen door, did you see the accused return again?—No; I never saw him afterwards.

Who was the next person who came to the kitchen that you saw?—Mrs. Jones; she did not come right down to the kitchen, but she stood over the stairs and said, "My hubby is gone." With that I went straight into the bar to George. I told George to go up, and then I stayed in the bar again.

When Mrs. Jones came into the kitchen was any one with her?—No; she did not come into the kitchen then, she came halfway down the stairs.

When was the next time you saw this bottle that had been put into the drawer?—I never saw it after until when Mrs. Jones came down to take it.

When was that?—It was after I had been down to the bar and back, and I was in the scullery then peeling potatoes.

After you heard Mr. Jones was dead or before?—After I had heard he was dead. Of course, he was not dead, not then, when they thought he was, not at first.

Mr. Justice Avory—After you had been told.

Examination continued—Mrs. Jones came into the kitchen?—Yes.

Was she alone or was any one with her?—Mrs. Whitewick was with her. Mrs. Jones went to the end dresser drawer. I saw her take a bottle out of the drawer.

Do not tell us what she said, but did she say something to you?—Yes. She and Mrs. Whitewick then left the kitchen.

Evidence for Prosecution.

Mrs Elizabeth M. Fisher

At any time while the bromo salts bottle was in the drawer did you touch it?—No; I never went near the drawer.

Cross-examined by Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—Except for Mr. Jones and Mrs. Jones, nobody had much conversation with the accused, because he could not understand English. He used to wait to have his meals until either Mr. and Mrs. Jones or Mrs. Jones was ready to have them too. For about a fortnight before Mr. Jones's death the accused had been getting up earlier. He used to have first thing in the morning the cold coffee that was left overnight, then he generally went to do some writing for about an hour, and I would get him some hot coffee. That had been going on for about a fortnight before Mr. Jones's death. I lighted the kitchen fire on the 29th, the day of Mr. Jones's death, as soon as I came down in the morning. That would be about seven o'clock. Mrs. Jones sometimes rang her bell from the bedroom if she wanted somebody.

Was it her habit to come downstairs for hot water or not?—No.

Did she ask you for hot water on the morning of Mr. Jones's death?—I do not remember her asking for it.

If you were not asked for hot water, or if the bell had not rung to take you upstairs to get an order, would you be in the habit of taking up hot water at a certain time?—Yes; the housemaid did; that is, Mrs. Hutley. Mrs. Hutley would take the hot water up in the ordinary way about nine, or sometimes after nine.

You do not remember being asked for hot water on this morning?—Not by Mrs. Jones; Mr. Jones shouted over the banisters to me for hot water. That would be about twenty or a quarter to ten, as near as I can say. I am not at all certain about the times.

You are not sure whether it would be right to say "I took the hot water upstairs just after ten o'clock," or whether you took it up at twenty-past nine?—No; I could not tell the exact time. Mrs. Whitewick took the breakfast up about half an hour after the hot water. I prepared the breakfast, of course.

From the time that you came down about seven o'clock to the kitchen and lit the fire, and so on, were you very busy there that morning?—Oh, yes, very busy; I was on my own as there were two absent. Mrs. Hutley was away—she is the housemaid. Mrs. Whitewick and her husband were there. That night there were two additional gentlemen staying in the hotel. I had to get tea ready for them in the morning.

After Mrs. Jones had put the bottle, which appeared to you to be a blue bottle, in the drawer, were you then cleaning the steps of the scullery?—No; I was making up the kitchen fire when Mrs. Jones came in with the bottle.

When the accused came down did he not say something first of all to you in French about a bottle? You may have heard a word which you might have thought was "bottle" or something like it in French. Do you remember or not?—I do not remember.

Mrs Elizabeth M. Fisher

Of course, if he did say something in French you would not have understood it?—No.

Would it be fair to say he may have said something in French? You are not sure one way or the other?—Perfectly fair.

After the drawer had been opened when the accused came down, I suggest to you he said something more in French?—I did not hear him.

Was he always saying things which you did not understand, and then saying a word or two of English?—If he wanted anything he would go into the larder and show you what he wanted. He would point all round; if he wanted a water can he would pick up a water can. He would go to the tap if he wanted cold water, if he could not make you understand. He tried to make me understand sometimes by broken English and French. After I pointed out the drawer and the bottle to him I went back and went on with my work in the scullery.

Although you were with your back to the scullery cleaning those steps you were able, I suppose, out of the corner of your eye, to see him go out of the kitchen?—No; I was not.

Did you see him go out of the kitchen?—I saw him come from the drawer as I knelt down.

Going towards the door?—Yes.

You could hear his steps, could you not?—Yes.

You heard his steps going towards the door and disappearing?—Yes.

And from that time when you saw him go towards the door and heard him go out you did not see anything more of him, did you?—No.

The next you saw of him was when?—I did not see him after.

You did not see him at all after that?—I did not see him at all after that, not till he came into the kitchen.

You did not see him at all after that, certainly until after Mrs. Jones had come to the kitchen for the bottle?—No; I did not see him again till after that.

You were all the time either in the scullery or the kitchen cleaning the steps, and so on?—Yes.

Re-examined by the Attorney-General—After I had finished cleaning the steps in the scullery I swept outside the back door, and hearth-stoned the window sill of the scullery window. One could see into the kitchen if one looked from the position I was standing in outside the back door.

Could people come in and out of the kitchen without your seeing them when you were standing there, or must you have seen them?—They could come in and out without my seeing them.

Mr. Justice Avory—The witness has said she was kneeling cleaning the steps from the inside, so that her back must have been towards the kitchen.

The Witness—Yes.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL—And after that I understand she went outside.

Mr. Justice AVORY—Yes.

Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—Yes, but she also said, of course, that she could hear his steps going towards the door although her back was turned.

Mr. Justice AVORY—Yes.

Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—There is another question, which slipped my memory, and which I ought to have put to Mrs. Fisher.

Mr. Justice AVORY—You had better put it at once.

Further cross-examined by Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—Upon any occasion have you seen Mrs. Jones taking something out of her bag and throwing it away?—No; I did not see that. I saw a purse in her hand as she was leaning over Mr. Jones after he was dead.

Did you see something taken out of a purse?—No; I did not see anything taken out.

Mr. Justice AVORY—You are speaking of after the death?

Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—Yes, after the death; and upon one occasion—I am not sure whether you saw this or not—a note, I suggest, was written. On a piece of paper some words were written one day by Mrs. Hutley in the kitchen as to a quarrel between Mr. and Mrs. Jones.

Mr. Justice AVORY—We cannot have the contents of the document. (*To Witness*)—First of all did you see Mrs. Hutley writing anything in the kitchen? She may have written letters?—She might have done.

By Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—May I put it another way. Do you remember an occasion when there had been a quarrel between Mr. and Mrs. Jones?—Yes; on the Sunday morning Mrs. Jones came down crying.

Do you remember which Sunday that was?—Yes; it was about a fortnight before the death.

When she came down crying was Mrs. Hutley there as well as you?—Mrs. Hutley was not in the kitchen then; Mrs. Whitewick was in the kitchen.

Did Mrs. Hutley come into the kitchen afterwards?—Yes; I think she did.

Did you see anything that was written on a piece of paper that day after the quarrel?—No; I did not.

Mrs. MARCELLA WHITEWICK, examined by the ATTORNEY-GENERAL—I am the wife of Ernest George Whitewick, and I live at 23 The Green, Mount Pleasant, New Malden. My husband was employed as manager at the hotel at Byfleet kept by Mrs. Jones, and I went there to help at the week-ends, both in the bar and in the house. I went there the last week-end in March. I arrived on the Friday evening, the 28th. I remember seeing

Mrs Marcella Whitewick

Mr. Jones on the morning of the 29th. I first saw him in the kitchen. I should think, to the best of my recollection, it would be about twenty minutes to nine when I first saw him. He was in his dressing-gown at the time. I saw him go out, but I could not tell you where he went to. I next saw him in the bar parlour a very few minutes afterwards. Mr. Vaquier was also in the bar parlour when I saw Mr. Jones there. I had gone in to dust the bar parlour when I found them there. I dusted the mantelpiece that morning. That was the first occasion upon which I had ever dusted the bar parlour. There were two bottles on the mantelpiece when I dusted it. One was a medicine bottle belonging to Mr. Jones, and the other was an iodine bottle. The medicine bottle was an ordinary white medicine bottle. To the best of my recollection, I think the iodine bottle was a small brown bottle. It was labelled "Iodine." I had not on any previous occasion seen a blue bottle in that room. There was not a blue bottle on the mantelpiece that morning when I dusted it; I am sure of that. During the time I was in that room dusting it I saw the accused move the iodine bottle from one side of the clock on the mantelpiece to the other; to the best of my recollection, I believe it was from the left of the clock to the right of the clock. I could not see any necessity for moving the bottles on the mantelpiece. I was not very long in the room dusting it, but I left it and returned again to finish dusting. I left the bar parlour to take up some hot water to Mr. and Mrs. Jones's bedroom. I saw the cook from where I was standing in the bar parlour about to take the hot water upstairs, and I offered to take it up for her. When I took it upstairs I found Mr. Jones in the bedroom; he was in bed. Mrs. Jones was not there. It would be after nine o'clock when I did that, but I cannot tell the exact time. When I left the bar parlour Mrs. Jones and Mr. Vaquier were in it. When I came down from the bedroom I went into the kitchen. I might have been about five or ten minutes there. I then took the breakfast upstairs to Mr. and Mrs. Jones in the bedroom; they were both present then. I then went downstairs to the bar. I might have passed in and out of the bar parlour again before the incident of Mr. Jones becoming ill occurred. I am afraid I cannot say whether I saw the accused at all between the time of my taking up breakfast and Mr. Jones taking ill. I next saw Mr. Jones when I went to remove the breakfast tray. He was not in the room when I entered, but he came in afterwards. He was dressed except for his collar and tie. I noticed he had not taken any breakfast. I gave him a cup of coffee at his request. I then went downstairs and took the breakfast tray with me. The next I heard was somebody coming along the passage rather quickly and somebody being sick. Subsequently I made a cup of tea and put some soda in it, and gave it to Mrs. Jones. Her husband came into the kitchen from the lavatory and drank the tea. He went back again to the lavatory and was sick again, but very

little. I noticed that he was trembling. He became worse, and had to be carried upstairs. It was Mr. Vaquier and my husband who carried him upstairs. I was also with him. I attempted to help in carrying him at first, and then my husband came to my assistance. After he had been taken upstairs I stayed in the bedroom with Mrs. Jones. The doctor came in about five minutes. I was in the bedroom up to Mr. Jones's death. To the best of my recollection, I think I only left the room on two occasions. The first occasion was to get a little brandy, and the second occasion was when I went with Mrs. Jones at the request of the doctor to get the bottle. We went down to the kitchen. Mrs. Jones took the bottle out of the drawer and handed it to me. [Shown blue bottle]—To the best of my recollection, it was a blue bottle like that, but it had a patent top on it. [Shown another bottle]—It was a bottle like that. I took the bottle and handed it to the doctor. I remember being in the bar parlour after Mr. Jones died when Mr. Vaquier and Mrs. Jones were present. I heard Mr. Vaquier ask Mrs. Jones if Monsieur was *couché*—meaning if Mr. Jones was sleeping.

Did Mrs. Jones make an answer to that?—Yes.

What did she say?—She said, "No; he is dead, and you have done it."

Did the accused say anything when Mrs. Jones said that?—Yes.

What did he say?—He said, "Oh, God, madam, do you accuse me?"

By Mr. Justice Avory—In English?—In broken English.

Examination continued—Was he doing anything when he said that?—Yes; he went on his knees.

When he was on his knees what did he do?—He wept bitterly.

I think you helped the doctor to sweep up certain white——

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—Do not lead as to this.

Examination continued—Were you in the bar parlour when the doctor was there?—Yes.

While you were there did you notice the doctor doing anything?—I did.

What was he doing?—He was picking up some crystals off the floor.

Did any one help him?—Yes; I assisted him.

What did you do with the crystals you picked up?—I put them in a small piece of paper which the doctor held in his hand.

Did you ever see Mrs. Jones with a small brown purse in her hand?—I did.

When was this?—After the death of Mr. Jones.

Did Mrs. Jones go anywhere with it?—Yes.

Where did she go to?—Mrs. Jones went to the lavatory with it first. It was to the upstairs lavatory she went.

About what time was this?—Some time after the death of Mr. Jones, perhaps about an hour.

Mrs Marcella Whitewick

After Mrs. Jones had come out did the purse drop on the floor?—Yes; it was on her way downstairs the purse dropped. That was after she came out of the lavatory. She went into the bedroom first, and I observed the purse in her hand, and on her way downstairs the purse dropped out of her dress.

Did you ever have any conversation with her as to what, if anything, she had done in the lavatory?—I did.

What did she say?—I asked her what it was that was in the purse.

What did she say?—She told me a small photograph of Mr. Vaquier.

The Attorney-General—The reason I asked that was because there were some questions which were put to Mrs. Jones, and I thought it right to ask it.

Mr. Justice Avory—Then the dropping of the purse on the way downstairs is not material, I gather.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—I want to carry it a little further.

The Attorney-General—I purposely put it in that short form in order that my friend might appreciate that this would seem to be the witness about whom he had been asking the questions from the last witness, and I thought he ought to know it.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Would you mind saying again what she told you?—I asked her what was in the purse, and she told me it was a small photograph of Mr. Vaquier.

Did she say what she had done with it?—No; she did not.

She told you simply that there was in the purse a small photograph of the prisoner?—Yes.

Cross-examined by Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—I understand that you had never seen, or never noticed, at any rate, a bottle of bromo salts upon the mantelpiece in the bar parlour?—That is right.

Not only had you not noticed one that morning, but you had never noticed them?—No.

When you first went into the bar parlour upon that morning would it be right to say there was no one in the room when you went in?—When I went in first there was no one in the room.

You have mentioned a bottle of iodine which you say was on the mantelpiece. Were there other things upon the mantelpiece beyond those two bottles?—There were.

Quite a lot of things?—Yes; there were some things; I would not say quite a lot, but there were other things upon the mantelpiece.

Are you able to tell me what all those other things were, or not?—To the best of my recollection, I can mention a few.

Some?—Some.

You cannot mention them all?—No, I cannot.

Evidence for Prosecution.

Mrs Marcella Whitewick

When you went up to the room into which Mr. Jones was taken, and when the doctor was there, did Mrs. Jones go out of the room once or twice for the purpose of getting water?—She might have come out. To the best of my recollection, she came out on two or three occasions.

How many times did you come out with her?—I came out on one occasion with her.

Upon the other occasion, or the other two occasions, assuming it was three, did she go out by herself?—Yes.

I want to get this from you: when the doctor asked for the bottle did Mrs. Jones say to you, "Come with me"?—Yes, she did.

So that the two of you went downstairs to get this little bottle?—Yes.

You went because you were invited to by Mrs. Jones?—Yes; because I did not know where the bottle was on my own.

Are you sure the conversation, which you say you heard that morning, and in which you say Mr. Vaquier asked if Monsieur was *couché*, took place after the death of Mr. Jones?—Yes.

Mrs. Jones has told us that she cannot recollect any conversation taking place with Vaquier that day after the death of Mr. Jones till the evening. Are you sure it was in the morning?—I am sure it was in the morning—quite sure.

Assuming it did take place, Vaquier, according to your story, was very upset indeed when an allegation was made against him?—He was.

And said. "Oh, God, madam, do you accuse me?" and palpably showed by the weeping and going on his knees that he was very disturbed at the accusation?—Yes.

When, as you say, he said to Mrs. Jones, "You accuse me," she made no reply to that?—No, because I said, "Don't say anything more; don't talk to him."

To whom did you say that?—I said it to Mrs. Jones.

You helped the doctor to pick up some crystals, you say, from the floor?—I did.

Were they lying between the table and the fireplace in the bar parlour?—They were lying on the edge of the hearthrug and also on the carpet; they would be at the edge of the table, between the end of the table and the fireplace.

Did you see anything else upon the floor except what you describe as crystals?—No; not to my knowledge.

You were picking the things up, and all you saw were crystals?—Yes.

And, as far as you could, helping the doctor, did you pick up all that there were there?—No.

One other matter before I come to the incident of the purse. You heard, did you not, when he was being sick in the lavatory?—Yes.

Could you give us any idea as to the length of time which elapsed between his being sick and when he came out and had the

cup of tea and went back again?—I should not have thought five minutes, to the best of my recollection.

And then he came out, you say, into the kitchen, and had the tea and went back to the lavatory?—Yes.

And did you hear him being sick again after the tea?—Yes, a little.

You heard him being a good deal more sick before?—Yes.

Then he had the tea, and then he was a little sick afterwards?—Yes.

I want to get a little more detail, if I can, from you about this other incident you have been asked about which took place about an hour after Mr. Jones's death, did it?—Within the hour.

Did you see Mrs. Jones go into the lavatory?—I did not actually see her go into it.

What was the first thing you did see in relation to this incident?—I saw her go to the dressing-table and take something from a handbag.

Can you say what that something was that she took from the handbag?—No, I could not.

What did you see next?—I went and asked where she was, because I did not see her go right to the lavatory, and I made inquiries where she had got to.

You did not see where she went to?—No.

Did you see where she came from?—I did.

Where did she come from?—She came from the lavatory.

Then what did she do?—She went into the bedroom.

Then?—She leant over Mr. Jones, with this purse in her hand, and spoke to Mr. Jones, and then we took her from the room.

What I want to know is about this incident when you say the purse dropped on the stairs?—When we left the room Mrs. Jones put this purse inside her dress.

When you say she spoke to Mr. Jones, was he alive or dead?—No; he was dead.

By Mr. Justice Avory—You believed he was dead?—No; I knew he was dead.

Cross-examination continued—Was it after the doctor had left?—After the doctor had left.

Then she came out of the room?—Yes.

What did you see?—I saw her put this purse inside her dress.

Then it dropped on the stairs?—It dropped on the stairs and I picked it up.

What did you say to her?—I said nothing to Mrs. Jones, but I opened the purse.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Had she gone on in front of you?—Mrs. Jones was going on in front of me.

Cross-examination continued—You opened the purse?—I did.

Was there anything in it?—No, there was not.

Did you afterwards speak to Mrs. Jones about it?—I did; not just then.

Evidence for Prosecution.

Mrs Marcella Whitewick

How long afterwards did you speak to her?—I should think it was about a couple of weeks after, before I spoke to her about it.

What did you say?—Well, I told her that there was one thing worrying me. She asked me what was it. I said, "What had you in your purse on the morning of Mr. Jones's death?" Mrs. Jones answered me and said, "A small photograph of Mr. Vaquier."

Did she say what had happened to it?—No.

Did you ask her what she had done with it?—No.

You are quite sure you saw her before she went downstairs coming out of that lavatory?—Yes.

Is that all you can tell us about it?—Yes.

Re-examined by the ATTORNEY-GENERAL—When Mr. Jones was dead and the doctor had gone, was there present in your mind a thought that he had been poisoned?—Well, I thought there was something; I did not think he had been actually poisoned.

Did every one in the hotel appear to be in a great state either of excitement or distress?—Very; everybody was upset.

Including yourself?—Yes.

Would I be right in assuming that never in your life has there been an incident at all approaching what happened that morning?—No.

Were you very much upset yourself?—Yes, I was.

Did every one in the hotel appear to be equally upset?—Yes.

Mrs. FLORENCE MARY HUTLEY, examined by Sir EDWARD MARSHALL HALL—I am the wife of Thomas Hutley, and I live at Albany Cottage, Byfleet. I have been acting as waitress-housemaid at the Blue Anchor Hotel since Mr. Jones took over the licence. They used sometimes to call me "Mrs. Harris"; that was my first husband's name. As far as I could say, Mr. and Mrs. Jones were on very good terms. I remember the arrival of the accused at the Blue Anchor. He had bedroom No. 9. He used to take his meals with Mrs. Jones. I remember an incident which took place one Sunday morning when Mrs. Jones went for a long walk, the accused spoke to me. I could understand what he was saying. I think he understood what I answered. He asked me where Mrs. Jones was. I pointed to the field, where she had gone over for a walk with her dog. He immediately went out of the coffee-room, and got his hat and went out to look for her. He came back about twenty minutes afterwards and asked me to look for Mrs. Jones. I went and looked for her.

What did he say?—"River."

Did he say anything else besides the word "river"?—He was talking French going along, and I could not understand him.

Did he mention anybody's name?—No; he did not mention any one's name. He seemed to be very excited and worried looking. I went to a cottage, where I saw a woman, and I asked her if she had seen Mrs. Jones. The accused went in one direction and I

went another. I returned to the hotel alone. When I got back the accused had not returned. Mrs. Jones arrived before the accused. When the accused did arrive he was in a very angry state of mind, and he immediately went to his bedroom. On the 28th March I was away on holiday from the Blue Anchor Hotel; I had asked for the week-end off. I have seen a bottle of salts like the one produced both on the mantelpiece in the bar parlour and also on the table there. I have never seen such a bottle in any other place. I left the Blue Anchor on the Friday night at about a quarter-past ten. I did not notice the bottle when I went away on the Friday night; neither did I see it on the Friday morning. The last time I saw the blue bottle on the mantelpiece was on the Thursday, when I took the bottle and put it on the bureau when I laid the luncheon table.

Cross-examined by Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—I had never seen the blue bottle in any other place than on the mantelpiece or on the table in the bar parlour. I, myself, put it on the bureau when I laid the luncheon table on the Thursday. That was the last place I left it in. I have no recollection of having seen the bottle on the Friday.

This occasion you have spoken about, when Vaquier went out into the field looking for Mrs. Jones—was that on a day when Mr. and Mrs. Jones had had a quarrel?—I do not know anything about the quarrel.

Just think a little and see. Were you not downstairs in the kitchen with Mrs. Fisher when Mrs. Jones came down crying?—No; I never saw Mrs. Jones crying.

Did not you know there had been a quarrel?—She looked a bit upset.

By Mr. Justice Avory—You mean on this Sunday?—Yes.

Cross-examination continued—Before she went out?—Before she went out.

Did not you know quite well——?—I am so busy of a Sunday morning I do not take much notice of anything that is going on. I had to work in the bar and get it done by a certain time, so I did not take any notice.

But you did notice she looked a bit worried?—Yes.

Had Vaquier been already out of doors before he came and asked you where Mrs. Jones was, do you know?—I do not know; I could not say.

It was the usual practice, was it not, for Mr. and Mrs. Jones to ring for hot water in the morning?—Yes.

And sometimes would Mr. Jones call over the top of the banisters for it?—Yes.

Re-examined by the Attorney-General—Mrs. Jones sometimes came downstairs in the morning before she was dressed. On one occasion I remember it was to get some clean clothes on

the Sunday morning. I do not remember her coming downstairs for anything else.

By Mr. Justice AVORY—Did you always answer the bell when she rang in the morning?—Yes; if I did not answer it, Fisher, the cook, would.

Who decided whether you or Fisher should answer the bell?—I usually used to go, but if I was going through I would say, "Would you mind going, Fisher, because I am busy with something," and Mrs. Fisher would go immediately.

Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—I do not know whether your lordship heard what she added: "And Mrs. Fisher would go immediately."

Mr. Justice AVORY—Yes. (*To Witness*)—Was it your practice to attend to the bar parlour in the morning?—Yes.

What time did you usually do it?—Directly I called Mr. and Mrs. Jones in the morning, I made it a practice to do that first.

About what time?—About twenty minutes to a quarter to nine. I swept and dusted the bar parlour. That time of the year, in March, I generally lit the fire too.

When you went to dust the bar parlour and light the fire, did you ever find the accused in the bar parlour?—Only on the Friday morning when I went in there to do it.

Which Friday morning?—On the Friday morning that I went off for the week-end, the 28th.

You found him then in the bar parlour?—No; he followed me in. That was the only time I have ever known him to do it.

What did he do, having followed you in?—He sat about whilst I did the room. I had to do the grate and sweep and dust the room. He sat there all the time.

ERNEST GEORGE WHITEWICK, examined by Mr. ROOME—I was manager at the Blue Anchor Hotel up to the time of Mr. Jones's death. I went there when Mr. Jones took over the licence. I slept first of all in the house, and later on in the bungalow in the grounds. I remember the accused arriving at the hotel.

What was his attitude towards Mrs. Jones? What did you notice?—Well, I thought they were inclined to be rather familiar; they seemed as if they had met previously.

What did you see which led you to suppose that?—I did not see it at first when he came there, but after the Frenchman had been there some time I noticed that Mr. Jones rather resented his presence at different times.

Was the accused with Mrs. Jones a great deal?—It did not matter where Mrs. Jones went, the accused followed her wherever she went. There was a wireless set at the Blue Anchor Hotel. I have seen the accused meddling with it, but I do not know whether he was mending it or not. I never saw him use any chemicals in connection with the wireless set. On the morning that Mr.

Jones died I went into the bar parlour about half-past eight. I could not say that I noticed any bottle of bromo salts on the mantelpiece that morning. Later on I saw Mr. Jones when he came down; he appeared to be in quite good health and cheerful. Later on I helped to carry him upstairs. I am in the habit of taking kruschen salts myself, and I keep the bottle on the kitchen dresser.

Cross-examined by Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—When you say that after a bit you thought that Mr. Jones was resenting the conduct of the accused and Mrs. Jones, was that because Mr. Jones very often used to go out of the room when they were there?—Yes.

That was the reason why you thought that?—Yes.

As a matter of fact, Mrs. Jones and the accused used to go out for walks together, did they not?—I cannot tell you. I do not know.

As far as this wireless set is concerned, did you see the accused very often mending it and operating it?—No; he was generally round it, but I did not know what he was doing, whether he was mending it or operating it. He was doing something to it.

On the 29th, in the morning, you do not remember seeing this bottle upon the mantelpiece?—No.

It sometimes was not there?—Correct.

Mr. Justice Avory—The witness has not said he ever saw it there.

Cross-examination continued—Had you ever seen it on the mantelpiece?—I had seen it there previously.

It was sometimes there and sometimes not there?—That is right.

You had nothing particular to draw your attention to it on the morning of the 29th March, one way or the other?—No.

Charles Henry Vincent, examined by Sir Edward Marshall Hall—I am Charles Henry Vincent—better known as "Old Wag." I was potman at the Blue Anchor Hotel. I remember the morning Mr. Jones died. I saw him in the bar parlour that morning about half-past seven. He counted out some money and handed it to me to take to the bank. I took the money to the bank.

Did he seem in good health when he gave you that?—Brighter and more cheery than I had seen him for at least a month.

Cross-examined by Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—You did not know how he had spent the night before?—I knew there was a party there when I left the bar.

In spite of that party he was brighter and more cheery than you had seen him for at least a month?—Yes; on the morning when I was going to the bank.

David Gordon Ross, examined by Mr. Roome—I live at West Byfleet. I keep a wireless shop there. I knew Mr. Jones, of the

Blue Anchor, pretty well. I visited the Blue Anchor pretty frequently of an evening during March. I went there on the evening of 28th March, a little before nine o'clock. I had my supper there. Later on I was one of the party in the bar parlour. I slept at the hotel that night. The next morning I came down about half-past seven, and left the hotel.

There was a good deal of drinking in the bar parlour that night, on the night of the party?—A fair amount, yes.

Cross-examined by Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—Did you happen to notice if Mrs. Jones was joining in the drinking or not?—I did not notice.

Did you notice if she was sleeping for an hour and a half or more?—I think she was asleep, yes.

Do you think that because you heard her say so?—No; I think I saw her asleep.

You are not sure about it?—No.

You went off about half-past one or two to bed, did you not?—Yes.

At that time there would be a good number of glasses on the table?—Yes.

How long have you known Mrs. Jones?—I first got to know Mrs. Jones about the end of 1923, about three months before 28th March.

Has she ever kissed you?—Yes.

Re-examined by the ATTORNEY-GENERAL—How often?—Once.

Mr. Justice AVORY—What is the relevance of this?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL—I do not know, but the question had been asked and I thought I had better deal with it.

Mr. Justice AVORY—I do not follow it.

WALTER ALFRED TUTOR, examined by Sir EDWARD MARSHALL HALL—I live at High Road, Byfleet, and I am a motor driver. On the night of 28th March I was at the Blue Anchor Hotel. I arrived about nine o'clock. I went into the saloon bar. I was served by Mr. Jones. I never went into the bar parlour at all. I left soon after ten o'clock.

Mr. Justice AVORY—I do not understand what these witnesses are being called for.

Sir EDWARD MARSHALL HALL—There was at one time a reason, but I do not know whether there is now.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL—There is a reason—to negative something which appears in one of the accused's statements.

Mr. Justice AVORY—Very good.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL—Now that I notice that there has been no cross-examination of the first one, I do not think it is necessary to call the others. I think Sir Henry knows the statement to which I refer. Now that there has been no cross-examination of

the last witness, unless he desires it, I do not propose to call the remaining members of the party. Although if he desires to ask any of them a question I will put them in the witness-box. [After speaking to Sir Henry Curtis Bennett]—I am afraid I must formally tender each witness.

Mr. Justice Avory—Very well.

George Norman Norris, examined by Sir Edward Marshall Hall—I am an engineer, and I live at North Birmingham. I was at the Blue Anchor, Byfleet, with some friends on the night of 28th March. I got there a few minutes before ten. There were several other people there, including Mrs. Jones.

It has been suggested that she was sleeping for some time?—She was.

There was a good deal of drinking that night. Did you ever see a bottle like that [shown one of the exhibits] on the table?—No.

If there had been a bottle like that would you have seen it?—I think I should. I am not very sure of the exact time I left, but I should think it would be some time between twelve and one. I saw the accused in the room. He left the room before I did. I did not see him come back again to the room. Mrs. Jones also left before I did.

Cross-examined by Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—You said there was a good deal of drinking going on there that night; that is right, is it not?—I did not say so, no.

It was put to you by my friend, and you said "Yes"?—I did not say "Yes." There was a certain amount of drink about, but I do not think I should say there was a good deal.

I will ask it more definitely. There was a good deal of drinking, was there not, that night?—I do not quite know what you would call a good deal. I do not know that my idea would be the same as yours.

You were there for two or three hours drinking, were you not?—Not drinking all the time.

With intervals?—Yes.

As a matter of fact, one of the party at the end had to be carried upstairs?—I do not think so.

Mr. Denley?—Mr. Denley was taken ill fairly early, soon after I got there.

Taken ill? Do you know what he was suffering from?—No.

I do not know whether you can remember or not, but I suggest to you that at the end of the evening there were about forty glasses on the table?—I did not notice them.

You would not like to say no to that, would you?—I could not say how many there were.

This little party took place in the bar parlour?—Yes.

Do you remember how many there were present?—I think there would be about eight there. It is quite a small room, about 10 or 11 feet square.

Evidence for Prosecution.

George Norman Norris

I suppose you were all talking during the evening. Did Mrs. Jones sleep through it?—I believe she was sleeping most of the time. The wireless was not on.

Did you notice much about the glasses on the table?—Only that there were some glasses on the table.

Do you not think there might have been this small bottle on the table too?—[Shown the exhibit]—I think, had there been so, I should have noticed it.

The Attorney-General—The next witness is a man named Denley; he is ill; I do not propose to call the doctor to prove that fact unless Sir Henry wants it.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—No.

Wilfred Harry Jarratt, examined by Mr. Roome—I was one of the party in the bar parlour at the Blue Anchor on 28th March. I saw Denley, Ross, the brothers Norris, Mrs. Jones, and the accused there. I saw the accused get up and go. It would be about 11 to 11.30, I should think, when he left. After he left the bar parlour he never came back again. I stayed until the very end.

By Mr. Justice Avory—What do you mean by the very end? What time?—I was the last to leave. I left about one o'clock.

Examination continued—I saw Mr. Jones turn out the lights before I left. I was quite sober myself. I did not see that night on the table a blue bottle like the one produced. I certainly should have noticed it if it had been there.

Cross-examined by Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—I was there right from nine o'clock till one. Between nine and ten I had four drinks. I had two bottles of XXX beer and some bitters. After ten I think I had other four bitters. That was eight drinks altogether. I think some of the other people had a good deal more; I missed several drinks. I assisted Denley upstairs.

I am not suggesting this bottle [referring to the blue bottle exhibited] was on the table all the evening. May not this bottle have been put on the table for a short time and taken off again?—I do not think so; I should have seen it.

I do not know whether you know that bromo salts is something which is taken sometimes by people who have had too much to drink?—I have heard so.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Do you mean taken at the time, when they are under the influence of drink, or taken next morning to remove the effects?—Next morning.

Cross-examination continued—Or that night, sometimes, before going to bed?—I have never heard of it.

Is there a door between the passage and the bar parlour?—There are hanging curtains over the door in the bar parlour

between the passage and the room. There is in fact no door between the passage and the bar parlour, but there are hanging curtains.

Reginald Alexander Turgell, examined by Sir Edward Marshall Hall—I live at 14 Harrington Square, London. I am an inquiry clerk at the Hotel Russell. I know the accused. On 9th February he came to the Hotel Russell as a visitor, and he occupied room 629 on the sixth floor. That is a single bedroom. [Shown exhibit No. 16]—That is in my handwriting. It is a telegram written in English, and it is dated 12th February. On that day the accused came to me with something written out in French which was addressed to Mrs. Jones, the Blue Anchor, Byfleet. It was the same as that telegram. I translated the French into English and wrote it on that form. Having translated it into English, I read it to the accused in French before I sent it. I speak French fluently. When I read it over to him he said, "Bien"—"Very good." He asked me how long the telegram would take to get there. I told him it was not very far from London, and I got the A B C and found the distance for him. He told me, "It is a lady I met in France whom I would like to see over here," or "It is a lady I met in France who has invited me to see her over here"; I am not quite sure which he said. He stayed at the hotel from the 9th to the 16th. After he left the hotel he came back several times. On 3rd March he came back and engaged room No. 549, a double room. I saw him that day between eight and a quarter to nine. He was with a lady. They both went upstairs. My attention was drawn to that fact by the liftman. I examined the register, and I found that he had registered "Mr. and Mrs."

By Mr. Justice Avory—Was he with the lady when he engaged the double room?—No.

I thought you said he came with a lady?—Yes, later on in the evening.

What time of the day was it he came and engaged the room?—I cannot say. The other witness is in the office.

Do you know anything about his engaging a room?—Yes; I knew he engaged a room by the registration sheet, which I have to check.

Arthur Francis Livermore, examined by Mr. Roome—I was second reception clerk at the Hotel Russell at the time that the accused came to stay at the hotel. I produce a sheet from the hotel register (exhibit No. 24), dated 9th February. I saw the accused sign his name to that sheet. It is the last signature on the page. He spelt his name "V-a-q-u-i-e-r." I also produce a registration form under the Aliens Act (exhibit No. 25). The name is spelt in the same way in that exhibit. I produce exhibit No. 26, which is the accused's hotel bill for the week, 9th February to 16th February. It amounts to £9 8s. 2d.

Mr. Justice AVORY—Was that found on the prisoner?

Mr. ROOME—Yes. (*To Witness*)—It was paid?—Paid to me, yes. It was paid by cheque on the afternoon of 16th February. The cheque is exhibit No. 18. The accused paid the bill, but the cheque is a cheque drawn by A. Jones on the National Provincial Bank of England at Kingston, and is for £14. I gave the accused the change.

Mr. Justice AVORY—Who is the cheque payable to?—Bearer.

Examination continued—It is endorsed on the back "A. Jones." There is no charge in that bill for dinner on 14th February, or for breakfast or dinner on the 15th, nor for breakfast on the 16th. The room is charged for the nights 14th and 15th. The reason for that is that it is a rule of the hotel that if luggage remains in a visitor's room the room is charged for. The accused returned to the hotel on 3rd March. I produce exhibit No. 27, which is the sheet from the register of 3rd March. The accused wrote the entry on that sheet in my presence. The entry is as follows, "Mme. and P. Vaquier. Nationality: Francaise. Permanent address: Paris." Then there is the room number, No. 549, a double room. I also produce the hotel bill of 3rd March (exhibit No. 28) for £1 12s. 9d. That bill has not yet been paid.

By Mr. Justice AVORY—The bill includes 15s. for apartments and a dinner bill of 10s. 3d., with a bottle of wine, 7s. 6d.

A single dinner or two dinners?—I should imagine it is an *à la carte* dinner.

For one or two?—That I could not say; it is just the total of the bill here.

Mr. Justice AVORY—Was that found on the prisoner too?

Mr. ROOME—Yes.

Examination continued—The 15s. for the bedroom is for one night only. There are two set *table d'hôte* dinners; one is in the dining-room, 6s. 6d., and the other is the restaurant *table d'hôte*, 8s. 6d. The amount in the bill is 10s. 3d., so it must be an *à la carte* dinner where people can take just what they please.

ANNIE MUFF, examined by Sir EDWARD MARSHALL HALL—I was until three weeks ago a chambermaid at the Hyde Park Hotel. In February of this year I was a chambermaid in the Hotel Russell. I remember seeing the accused at that time. He came about the end of the week. He had a single bedroom. On the Tuesday after his arrival I went up to get the room ready, and I found the door was locked.

Did you hear a lady's voice speaking in the room?—Yes.

Did you then see him and the lady coming out of the room?—Yes.

At about what time?—Between seven and eight in the evening.

Did they go down in the lift, and you did not see either of them again that night?—No.

Annie Muff

On the following Thursday morning did you go to the room between ten and eleven o'clock and knock at the door?—Yes.

Did a lady's voice tell you to come in?—Yes. The Tuesday I have referred to was the 12th; therefore the Thursday would be the 14th. It was the same room.

A lady's voice said, "Come in"?—Yes. I went in. I found a lady there as well as the accused. The lady was standing at the side of the bed fully dressed. The accused was standing at the foot of the bed, also fully dressed. The lady asked me to bring hot water. I asked her if she had slept there all night.

Did the lady say something?—The lady said, "Yes, I have; I am his wife."

Sir Edward Marshall Hall—Let Mrs. Jones come forward. (*To Witness*)—Is that the lady?—Yes. That is the same lady as I saw come out of the room on the previous Tuesday. I did not notice any book, letter, or anything in the room.

Did you see a dictionary in the room?—Yes.

Did you ever speak to the accused?—Well, no. He once asked me a question, and I asked him when he was leaving. That is all.

Horace Bland, examined by the Attorney-General—I live at 99 Queen's Road, Finsbury Park, and I am a partner in the firm of W. Jones & Co., wholesale and retail chemists, 134 Southampton Row. I speak French. I have seen the accused in my shop. As near as I can fix the date, I first saw him in the shop about the middle of February of this year. I did not know his name on that occasion nor where he was living. He came to the shop several times.

Do not take your mind for the moment to the month of March, but during the month of February and the several times he came what did he buy from your shop?—He bought many things, including lists of various chemicals for use in wireless experiments.

I am asking first what he bought. He bought many things, including a list of chemicals?—He brought a list, and we supplied him with the goods.

Did he buy any toilet requirements?—Yes.

First of all about the toilet requisites. In addition to that did he ask you to supply him with chemicals?—Yes.

Had he got a list of what he wanted, or did he merely ask you for the things?—He generally brought a list in.

Give us an example of the sort of chemicals which he bought in February?—Cobalt nitrate, oxide of tin, silver nitrate, sodium acetate, copper acetate, and perhaps some others which I cannot recollect.

In regard to each of those articles you have mentioned, were the quantities substantially large?—Yes.

More or less than half a pound?—About half a pound or slightly less.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett, K.C.

Were any of those substances included in the list of poisons which have to be registered?—No.

Are those things which you can sell to strangers without inquiry?—Yes. From time to time when he came into my shop I got into conversation with him. I asked him what he wanted the chemicals for, and he told me it was for experimenting in wireless. I remember the accused coming in again on 1st March. I cannot recollect how many days it was before that that I had last seen him, but it was two or three days previously. I got to know his name in conversation or in one way or another before 1st March. I cannot remember how long before 1st March it was before I got to know his name; it came out quite casually. When he came in on 1st March he had another list of chemicals which he required. It was a list about the same length as the others—about eight or nine articles on it. I think I made a copy of the list and made up the articles, and then destroyed the list. I have not got a copy now.

The Attorney-General—I understand Sir Henry raises no objection to my asking now the contents of this. I have been given a notice to produce the original. We have not got it.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—I did give notice, because I wanted to know exactly what it was, so I should like my learned friend to ask.

Mr. Justice Avory—At present it stands in this way that the original list was retained by the accused.

The Attorney-General—Yes.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—Does he say that?

The Witness—Yes; I copied it and handed back the original to the accused.

Mr. Justice Avory—Just inquire whether, in fact, any such list was found in the possession of the accused when he was arrested.

The Attorney-General—No such list as far as we are aware.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—I should like my learned friend to ask what the things were.

Mr. Justice Avory—Very well.

Examination continued—Will you just tell me about the list. I want first of all to keep to the things, if there were any, of the same nature as were in the previous lists. Did he require similar sorts of things such as the ones you have mentioned?—All of these were on the list.

By Mr. Justice Avory—You mean all of those you have mentioned were on the list on 1st March?—Yes.

Examination continued—Were there on the list any things for which he had not previously made application?—Yes.

What were the things that you have in mind?—Some perchloride of mercury.

By Mr. Justice Avory—In addition to the other articles?—Yes, and some strychnine.

Horace Bland

Examination continued—Any particular preparation of strychnine?—Strychnine was on the list only.

What quantity did he require of the perchloride?—Twenty grammes.

In quantity what would that represent? Is it a liquid or a solid?—A solid.

What quantity would that represent?—Two-thirds of an ounce approximately.

Is that perchloride in the scheduled list of poisons?—Yes.

In addition to that he asked for strychnine?—Yes.

What quantity of strychnine did he require?—.12 of a gramme.

[Shown exhibit No. 43]—Is that about the quantity?—Yes.

Is strychnine a very deadly poison?—Yes.

With regard to the perchloride, the other substance you mentioned, is that a deadly poison?—Yes.

Which is the more deadly of the two?—They are both about the same, I think.

Is that small quantity there sufficient to kill several people?—Yes, I should think so.

Are there certain restrictions under which chemists are allowed to sell these poisons?—Yes.

The Attorney-General—It might perhaps be convenient at this moment that I should bring your lordship's attention to the section of the Act under which it is permitted. It is section 17 of the Sale of Poisons Act, 31 & 32 Victoria, Chapter 121. The Act is 1868. It is in these terms: "It shall be unlawful to sell any poison either by wholesale or by retail unless the box, bottle, vessel, wrapper, or cover in which such poison is contained is distinctly labelled with the name of the article and the word 'Poison,' and with the name and address of the seller of the poison; and it shall be unlawful to sell any poison of those which are in the first part of Schedule A to this Act, or may hereafter be added thereto under section 2 of this Act, to any person unknown to the seller, unless introduced by some person known to the seller." There is more in the section, but nothing which is relevant to this matter.

Mr. Justice Avory—Is there not some later legislation?

The Attorney-General—Yes; there is a 1908 Act, which varies and affects the Schedule. As a matter of fact, "strychnine and all poisonous vegetable alkaloids and other salts" appears in Schedule A of this Act to 1868.

Mr. Justice Avory—Does perchloride of mercury appear in the Schedule to that Act?

The Attorney-General—I do not think it does in this Act.

Mr. Justice Avory—It probably does in the later Act.

The Attorney-General—It does appear in the earlier Act under the name of "corrosive sublimate."

Evidence for Prosecution.

Horace Bland

Examination continued—Were you aware of the restrictions as to selling poisons to persons whom you did not know?—Yes.

Is this a matter which is generally known among chemists?—Yes.

Did you ask the accused what he wanted these two poisons for?—Yes.

What did he say?—For wireless experiments—the same explanation which he had given before.

Did you believe him when he gave you that explanation?—I could not quite see how he was going to use the strychnine for it, but after discussing it with him I gave in to his judgment as a wireless expert.

You say, "After discussing it with him." Did he tell you in what way he was going to use the strychnine?—No; he did not explain in what way.

By Mr. Justice Avory—I gather you suggested some doubt to him when he said he wanted it for wireless experiments?—Yes.

What did you say?—I told him these were very deadly poisons, and I did not like to let him have them, because I did not see how he was going to use them.

You could not see how he was going to use them for wireless experiments. Is that what you said?—Yes.

What did he say in reply?—He said that when he was in France he could get any quantity of poisons he liked, and that he habitually bought them and experimented with them.

In any quantity did he say he bought them?—Yes.

Examination continued—Are you compelled by the Act to keep a register of poisons?—Yes. We have to record the date when we sell it and the name of the person who buys it, also the description and quantity of the poison sold, and for what it is wanted. In addition, the person who buys it has to sign his name in the book against the entry.

[Shown exhibit No. 8]—Is that taken out of your usual poison book?—Yes.

What is the date of his purchase?—1st March, 1924.

Is the name and the address of the purchaser filled in?—Yes.

What is written against that?—"Mr. Wanker, Room 60, Hotel Russell."

In whose handwriting is that?—Mine.

From whom did you get the name and address of the purchaser?—From the accused.

What have you filled in in the column "Name and quantity of poison sold"?—Perchloride of mercury, 20 grammes; and strychnine hydrochloride, .12 of a gramme.

You told us that in the list the substance asked for was strychnine simply?—Yes.

Why did you give hydrochloride of strychnine?—Because it is nearly always used; it is not often one uses the alkaloid.

Had you got the alkaloid in your shop?—Yes.

Did you ask the accused which he preferred, or did you give him that hydrochloride without asking him?—I gave it to him without asking him.

Are they equally deadly poisons?—Yes.

Is one of them more soluble than the other?—Yes.

Which is the more soluble?—The hydrochloride.

Will you look at the exhibit in that test tube. Who put that substance into that test tube?—I did.

Did you seal it up?—Yes.

Are you able to tell us the exact quantity that there is in that test tube?—Yes, .12 of a gramme.

Precisely the same quantity as he purchased?—Yes.

Did you get that from the same bulk as the poison which you sold to him or not?—I cannot swear to that; he may have bought some other things.

In substance, is there any difference between what you sold him and what appears in that test tube?—No. After the words describing the nature of the poison appears the purpose for which the poison is wanted. Under that heading has been written "For wireless experiments." Up to that point the entry is in my handwriting. This was all written out first and then the signature was put to it.

Did you see that signature written yourself?—Yes.

Who wrote it?—The accused.

What has he written?—"J. Vanker."

It looks as though the signature is "J. Wanker"?—Yes.

You had written under the name of the purchaser "Mr. Wanker"?—Yes.

How did you know how to spell the name Wanker?—The accused spelt it to me.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Were you talking to him in French or in English?—In French.

Examination continued—I speak French fairly well. I have no difficulty in making myself understood in French or understanding French.

After the register had been signed did he take the poison away with him?—He took the strychnine and perchloride with him.

What about the other things?—He came back for the others.

He took the two poisons first. When did he come back for the others?—An hour or two later.

Did he give any reasons why he wanted to take away the two poisons without the others?—No.

Did you ask him?—I think I suggested he should call back for the others.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Was it a heavy parcel?—There were several things to weigh up.

You mean you let him have these two before you completed the weighing of the others?—Yes.

Evidence for Prosecution.

Horace Bland

Examination continued—I see from your register that you did not make any more entries in your poisons book till 11th March?—Yes.

Have you any doubt at all about the accused being the person who bought those poisons on that day?—None whatever. On 16th April last I saw a photograph in a newspaper which appeared to me to be that of some one I recognised.

Who did the photograph appear to you to be of?—The person to whom I had sold the strychnine in the name of Vanker.

By that you mean the accused?—Yes.

In consequence of that did you communicate with Scotland Yard?—Yes. I had not seen the accused between the day that I sold him the poison, that is to say, 1st March, and the day that I communicated with Scotland Yard.

By Mr. Justice Avory—You have not asked what happened in consequence of having communicated with Scotland Yard. Did you see the prisoner?—Yes.

Where?—At Tottenham Court Road Police Station.

Did you pick him out?—I picked him out from a crowd of others.

When you picked him out did anything take place?—He wanted to greet me and stepped forward.

He appeared to recognise you?—Yes, directly I entered the room.

Cross-examined by Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—There was no sort of question about trying that you should not identify him. He in fact stepped forward as if he wanted to greet you?—Yes. I have been a chemist since some time before the war. I have been qualified for about fourteen years. I think it was on the second or third occasion that the accused came to my shop that I learned what his name was. I asked him what his name was and he told me.

By Mr. Justice Avory—What did he tell you?—He told me what I understood at the time to be Vanker.

You took him to say——?—Vanker, but I have not attached much importance to the exact pronunciation, because I only just made a note for myself.

Cross-examination continued—When you asked him his name and he told you his name, which you understood to be Vanquier——?—Vanker.

How would you spell it in French, what you understood?—I should spell it Vancquer or Vanquer.

At the time when you understood him to say that, there was no question of buying deadly poisons, was there?—No. He was buying at that time ordinary toilet articles and things which he said were for wireless experiments.

When he gave orders for such things as oxide of tin and sodium acetate, and so on, did he always bring in a list with

these things already written out?—He always did that, or he opened a notebook of his and read them out. In giving his order he always ordered in grammes, speaking in French. There are 15.4 grains in a gramme. Two grains would be .13 of a gramme approximately. On 1st March, when he came to my shop, he produced a list already written. He may have handed it to me. I have no written record of what was on that list, but I know there were eight or nine articles on it. The amounts of the articles required were already upon the list. I made out the document, exhibit No. 8, which is the poisons book, in my own handwriting.

And all you would do would be to say to the customer, "Sign there"?—No.

What would you do?—In a case like that where I was not sure of his name I asked him to spell his name. I very often had to.

You were not surprised that it was spelt in that way?—No.

A sort of English spelling of a French name?—They spell their names so curiously, some of these foreigners, I was not surprised.

At any rate, you wrote it down and you would write the rest of the entry down, except, of course, the final signature?—Yes.

Having made the whole of the entry, would you say, "Sign there"?—Yes.

Or would you say, "Sign there" sometimes before you filled up the whole entry?—We always say "Sign" after we fill up the entry. When he handed his list in I said to him, "What are these things for?" and he said, "Wireless experiments." There were eight or nine things on the list, five of which were those I have already mentioned, namely, cobalt nitrate, oxide of tin, silver nitrate, sodium acetate, and copper acetate. Iodine was also on the list, and I think there was chloroform too. I could not say that against the five articles I mentioned in examination-in-chief the amount required in each instance was 100 grammes; I do not think it was. They were varying amounts; they were not all the same amount. One might have been 100 grammes and another 50, and so on.

I suggest to you that you did not ask him any questions in particular about strychnine, but asked him the question, as I have already put it to you, about the list directly it was handed to you?—No; that is not right.

You did ask him about the list?—Yes; but I asked him about the others in particular. There is really no record of this sale at all except the poisons book. We have books in which we enter up articles to anybody who has an account with the firm, but this was a cash transaction. We do not enter up things in a cash transaction.

I suggest to you that perchloride of mercury was not on that list at all?—That is not right; it was on the list—sublimate. That is the same thing. It was put in French.

I am suggesting to you there was nothing, either perchloride of mercury, or anything to mean perchloride of mercury, on that list?—That suggestion is not right; it was there right enough. I am sure that corrosive sublimate was on the list, but I will not be sure about the word "corrosive." Very often they are abbreviated. I will say that it was sublimate that was on the list. I kept the original list at the time until the rest of the goods were called for. They were all called for except one. I did not hand them over.

I suggest, instead of .12 of strychnine, there were in fact 100 grammes for some of these things, 50 grammes for others, and 25 grammes of strychnine?—No; that is not right.

.12 is an extraordinary figure to choose, is not it?—Very extraordinary.

It is not 2 grains, not 1 grain, not a grain and a half?—It is very extraordinary.

25 grammes, if it was on the list, would be an enormous quantity of strychnine?—Yes.

How did you in fact deliver the strychnine?—In paper.

Do you really say that?—Yes.

This little quantity of deadly poison, we are told, could kill four or five people. You put it in a little piece of paper?—I wrapped it correctly, in the proper way, not doubled up anyhow, of course.

Do you say it was in a little piece of paper?—It was exactly the same as an ordinary powder that any one would take, a headache powder. It was wrapped like that. I delivered the perchloride also in paper.

[Shown phial containing about 20 grammes of perchloride]—That, you delivered, did you, in paper?—Yes.

You have said these two poisons were about as deadly as each other?—Yes.

That is nothing like right, is it?—I am not the man to say that really.

You did say it?—I should say it is right.

As a matter of fact, whatever it was that you did deliver to this gentleman, did you not deliver it in a bottle?—No.

What did you charge for these articles you wrapped up in paper?—I could not tell you now—not very much. I cannot remember what I charged, but it would be about 2d. for the strychnine, I should think, and not much more for the other. As regards the cobalt and the oxide of tin, and so on, altogether they came to over £1.

When you asked him to wait because these things had to be weighed out, do you know he said to the other man in the shop, "It is very annoying, as I come from Byfleet"?—No, he did not say that; I served him with them. I gave him the things that he got away that day. He did not take them all away on 1st

March. He called twice on 1st March, but he had not enough money to pay for the others when he came back for them, so he could not take them all, and he said, "I will come back later on for the rest." I think he must have left about three things behind. He came back, I think, once about two or three days later; I cannot recollect the exact day. On 1st March, when he left the shop the first time, he just took the perchloride and strychnine with him. He came back in, I should say, two or three hours for the other things.

I suggest to you he did not go away, but he waited and took all that he took that day at the same time?—That is not right.

The Court adjourned.

Third Day—Friday, 4th July, 1924.

HORACE BLAND, recalled, re-examined by the ATTORNEY-GENERAL—Do you remember yesterday being asked whether it was a fact that you had supplied 25 grammes of strychnine on this date?—Yes.

Had you anything like that quantity in your shop that day?—No.

Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—I do not want there to be any misunderstanding. I did not suggest this gentleman had actually supplied 25 grammes. What I suggested was he was asked to supply 25 grammes.

Mr. Justice AVORY—Quite true. His answer was, "I am sure that the list did not specify 25 grammes."

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL—I am afraid the purport of the question was not quite plain to me. I just want to ask this. (*To Witness*)—When the list was supplied to you did the accused at any time suggest that you had not supplied him with all the strychnine that he wanted?—No.

Dr. FREDERICK CHARLES CARLE, examined by Sir EDWARD MARSHALL HALL—I am a registered medical practitioner, and I practise at West Byfleet. I had attended the late Mr. Jones from about 7th January, 1924. His average health was good. I remember him coming back from Margate on 17th February. At that time he was suffering from influenza and some congestion of the lungs. As far as I am able to judge from my books, he was in bed from the 17th to the 26th February, and was upstairs for practically three weeks. By the 28th March he had fully recovered from the congestion and the influenza. My last visit prior to the visit of 29th March was on 11th March.

By Mr. Justice AVORY—Had he then recovered?—He had recovered.

On 11th March?—Yes.

Examination continued—I was summoned about half-past eleven or thereabouts on the morning of 29th March by telephone. I arrived at the Blue Anchor at 11.50 in the morning.

Only answer this question yes or no: at the time did you know anything of what was the matter?—No. When I got to the Blue Anchor I went straight to the bedroom.

Before you arrived at the bedroom or at the door of the house had you heard a noise proceeding from the bedroom?—Yes, shouts and screams.

Dr Frederick C. Carle

On your way up to the bedroom did you see any of the occupants of the hotel at all?—Not until I got to the bedroom door.

Whom did you see then?—I saw the accused.

Where was he?—Standing in the doorway of the bedroom. In the bedroom I found Mr. Jones, Mrs. Jones, and Mrs. Whitewick. Mr. Jones was on the bed fully dressed. He was in a state of convulsions, extremely terrified, and calling out for help. He was quite conscious and able to speak.

Answer this question yes or no. Did he make a statement to you in answer to a question of yours?—Yes.

Tell me the movements of the body—what were they? Were there convulsive movements of the body?—Of the limbs and body.

Were they increasing or decreasing?—Increasing.

Was the whole body affected?—All except the lower part of the face.

Did these convulsions become continuous?—Yes.

Respiration ceased?—Yes.

And unconsciousness supervened?—Yes.

Then I think you applied what is a well-known remedy, artificial respiration in a modified form?—Yes.

Did you get him back to complete consciousness?—Yes.

And for a period of about seven minutes these convulsive movements ceased?—Yes.

Was some water got at your request?—Yes.

Did you try to give him some water?—Yes.

Was it successful?—No.

Who got the water, do you know?—I cannot remember exactly who gave it to me. Some one went from the room to get it.

Can you remember whether or no any stimulant was got while you were there?—No.

Did the convulsive movements come back?—Yes.

The convulsive movements recurred and he died?—Yes.

At that time had you formed an opinion as to the cause of death?—Yes.

Was that an opinion which was subsequently confirmed by a post-mortem examination?—Yes.

What, in your opinion, did Mr. Jones die of?—The actual cause of death was asphyxia.

And what was the cause of the asphyxia, in your opinion?—A poison acting similarly to strychnine.

Consistent with the administration of strychnine?—Quite.

Assuming it was strychnine, could you form an opinion of the time within which that dose had been administered before the death?—Half an hour.

From somebody did you receive a statement with regard to a certain bottle?—Yes.

Then did you ask for the bottle?—I did.

Evidence for Prosecution.

Dr Frederick C. Carle

By Mr. Justice Avory—Who was the person who made any statement which led you to ask for the bottle?—Mrs. Jones.

Examination continued—Who went for the bottle?—Mrs. Whitewick.

Did she go alone?—Yes.

Who brought you the bottle?—Mrs. Whitewick.

Who was in the room?—Mrs. Jones and the dead man.

Was he then dead or not?—Well, he was practically dead.

Where was Mrs. Jones when Mrs. Whitewick went out of the room?—She stayed in the room.

Were you doing anything to the dead or dying man at that time when Mrs. Whitewick went to get you the bottle?—I repeated my efforts at artificial respiration in the hope that he would recover.

[Shown exhibit No. 37]—What did you do with the bottle afterwards? To whom did you hand it?—I handed it to nobody; I put it on a piece of furniture in the bedroom.

And left it there?—Left it there.

Look at that bottle [exhibit No. 37]—As far as you know, is that similar to the bottle that you saw?—Precisely.

Look at that through the glass. Is there anything in it now?—No.

Is it practically dry now or is it damp, or what? Can you form an opinion?—It is practically dry.

When the bottle was handed to you what did you do with it? What did you do then and there?—Then and there I looked inside it, and I saw a little liquid in it.

Was there any powder of any sort or shape in it?—No.

Was there solid matter, as far as you could see, of any sort, or not?—No.

About how much liquid was there?—About half a teaspoon.

What did you do?—I poured a little into my hand and tasted it.

How did it taste?—Slightly bitter.

Was the bitterness sufficient to enable you to say the cause of the bitterness?—Well, it was distinctly bitter as compared with clear fluid.

Then did you ask for, or was it produced to you, a glass and spoon [shown exhibit No. 38]. Does that look like the spoon and glass?—Yes.

As far as you know, was that the spoon and glass out of which the drink had been drunk by Mr. Jones?—As far as I know, this is the glass and spoon.

Did you go downstairs after this?—I did. No one went downstairs with me to the bar parlour.

Did anything take place in the bar parlour: did you do anything?—I went out of the hotel with the spoon, glass, and bottle, intending not to lose sight of them. I went to my car, and there I saw a police officer. I beckoned him, and I told him——

You made a statement?—I told him shortly what had happened and said, "You must take charge of these; come into the hotel with me and look round."

Then did you go into the bar parlour?—I took him with me into the bar parlour.

What did you do in the bar parlour? Did you do anything yourself, or did anybody do anything in your presence, do you remember?—I looked on the floor expecting to find what I had already been told—expecting to find some of the salts that the deceased man had taken, which I heard had been spilt.

Did you find anything on the floor?—Yes.

What did you find on the floor?—I saw sprinkled on the floor some powdery looking substance.

Did you pick anything off the floor?—I looked closely and saw small crystals on the floor, and other white powdery substance.

What did you pick up?—I picked up the small crystals, a few of them.

After you had picked them up what did you do with them?—I put them in a small piece of paper, wrapped them carefully up, and placed them in an envelope.

Can you give me any idea as to the quantity?—I should think I picked up a dozen.

What did you do with the little paper packet?—I put it in an envelope and handed it to Police Constable Cranford for safe keeping. [Witness identified exhibit No. 40 as the envelope and the piece of paper referred to.] On 31st March I made a post-mortem examination of the deceased. I removed the stomach and a section of the small intestines, with the contents, which I put in two bottles which were sealed in my presence. I handed those bottles to Superintendent Boshier.

Cross-examined by Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—I arrived at the Blue Anchor at 11.50 and I left at 12.30. The death had taken place about a quarter of an hour before I left. I only sent for water on one occasion.

When you asked for the bottle it was Mrs. Whitewick who went to fetch it and brought it to you, Mrs. Jones remaining in the room?—Yes.

Supposing strychnine is mixed with bromo salts, would that have the effect of preventing the bromo salts from fizzing?—I should say not.

If a dose, therefore, of bromo salts and strychnine were taken together, the bromo salts would fizz, and, of course, the strychnine would not?—Yes.

[Shown exhibit No. 43]—That is said to be .12 of a gramme of strychnine, just under 2 grains, we were told yesterday. What would you say about that. Would it be as much as a quarter of a teaspoon, the whole of that?—Not so much.

Evidence for Prosecution.

Dr Frederick C. Carle

If you put the whole of the .12 of a gramme into a teaspoon, in your view, it would not be as much as a quarter of a teaspoon? —No—of this particular sort of strychnine.

Quite; that is hydrochloride of strychnine. When you went downstairs to the bar parlour you saw some crystals, you say, upon the floor?—Yes.

Did you see upon the floor any bromo salts?—I saw an indefinite powdery substance upon the floor. From the height of my eyes from the ground I could not say exactly what it was. I dropped, therefore, on my knees and examined more closely, when I was able to distinguish a white powdery substance, intermixed with crystals—that is to say, larger crystals than are in the bottle exhibited to me.

Did you see any definite little round things as you find in bromo salts, or only this powdered substance?—Only a powdered substance.

I understand that is a new bottle of bromo salts. Would you describe them as granules?—Hardly as granules.

What is the proper description?—Honestly, I have never seen the preparation before.

At any rate, what you saw upon the ground was some white powdery substance and nothing round, such as those salts.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Is it called granulated?—Yes; that is definitely granulated.

Cross-examination continued—When the bottle was in fact brought to you by Mrs. Whitewick, should I be right in saying that the appearance was that it had been washed out and a little liquid left in?—Yes.

Re-examined by the Attorney-General—Do you know anything about this bromo salts substance?—No.

I daresay you have had experience of this sort of substance, effervescent saline preparations?—Yes.

When you get to the end of a bottle which has been opened for some time does the effervescence tend to increase or decrease? —It should decrease.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—May I ask one further question?

Further cross-examined by Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—In the bar parlour when you were picking up the crystals, kneeling upon the floor, was Mrs. Jones present or not?—Not to my knowledge.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Just take this bottle. [Handed bottle of bromo salts]—Although that is granulated, when you come to the end of the bottle would you expect to find some powder at the bottom?—I should.

Police Constable Percy Ernest Cranford, examined by Mr. Roome—I am a police constable stationed at Byfleet. On the morning of 29th March I received from Dr. Carle a blue bottle,

a glass and a spoon, and a small paper packet. [Shown exhibits Nos. 37, 38, and 40]—Those are the articles I refer to. I handed them to Mr. Webster. I also handed to Mr. Webster two sealed glass bottles containing portions of the organs of Mr. Jones. I saw the organs placed in the bottles by the Coroner. I also received from Superintendent Boshier a new bottle of bromo salts. That is exhibit 39. I handed that to Mr. Webster as well.

George Herbert Boutell, examined by Sir Edward Marshall Hall—I live at Byfleet, and I am a builder and undertaker. I knew Alfred George Poynter Jones since he came to Byfleet in August, 1923. On 3rd April, 1924, I saw his dead body at the Byfleet mortuary. I took it to the Blue Anchor and put it in the coffin, and screwed on the lid of the coffin. The following day I was present at St. Mary's Church, where the body was buried. On the night of 25th April I pointed out the grave in which I had buried that body to Superintendent Boshier, and on the morning of 26th April, at ten minutes to ten, I attended at the Byfleet mortuary, and I there saw the coffin which I had buried. I unscrewed it in the presence of Sir Bernard Spilsbury, Dr. Carle, Dr. Brewer, and Superintendent Boshier. The body that was found therein was the body of Mr. Jones whom I had buried.

Sir Bernard Henry Spilsbury, examined by the Attorney-General—I have for some years past been pathologist to the Home Office. I have now practically retired, and only come in for special cases when I am asked. I was requested by the Home Office to examine the exhumed body of Alfred George Poynter Jones at the mortuary at Byfleet on 26th April. The body was identified in my presence and the presence of others by the last witness. I have been in Court this morning and heard the evidence of Dr. Carle. From the description which he gave of the symptoms and the ultimate death of Alfred Jones, I am able to form an opinion as to the probable cause of death. In my opinion, those symptoms point to poisoning by strychnine.

I want to ask you one or two questions about strychnine, particularly this preparation of strychnine which we have had discussed in this case, the hydrochloride of strychnine. What is a fatal dose to an ordinary adult person?—The minimum fatal dose is about half a grain; that has proved fatal on several occasions.

I was accurate when I suggested that 2 grains would be enough to kill four people?—Yes.

Is there any peculiarity about the taste of strychnine?—Yes; it has a very characteristic and a very intense bitter taste.

I want to assume for a moment the case of a person whose stomach and intestine have been examined and found to contain seventeen-thirtieths of a grain of strychnine. Are you able from that to form an opinion as to the quantity which the dead person

probably consumed?—Only, of course, approximately. Am I to assume also that vomiting had occurred as part of the symptoms?

Yes?—In that event an amount considerably more than that must have been taken.

Greater than seventeen-thirtieths of a grain?—Yes—over a grain, I should think, certainly, and not much less than 2, I should anticipate.

About another substance—bromo salts—have you ever had those under your observation before? Do you know anything about this preparation?—No; it is a patent preparation. I knew nothing of its composition till I heard of it in this case. I think I knew the name and that is all.

Have you frequently had under your consideration ordinary effervescent saline preparations of various sorts?—Yes; I am familiar with them.

In your opinion, is the effervescence affected at all by the length of time the bottle has been opened?—Yes. If the bottle has remained unstoppered at all, and dampness has got into it, the effervescence would tend to diminish towards the end of the bottle.

In preparations of this sort, as you get to the bottom of the bottle, is the density of the substance affected at all?—Not so much the density as the character of the substance.

What would be the effect, on coming to the bottom of a bottle such as this, with regard to the size of the grains which would appear in the bottle?—The granular character of that preparation would never be quite complete even in a full bottle; there would probably be at the bottom a number of granules which had powdered to a powder, and in the handling of the bottle that would continue.

Now, about your examination of the dead man. I do not want you to give it to us in anything like the detail that you have done in the past. First of all with regard to the hands, did you notice the condition and the position of the hands when you examined them?—Yes; they were in a half-closed condition.

What does that indicate?—It suggests that they were clenched at the time of death.

Have you any information you can give the Court about the colour of portions of the lips and fingers and toe-nails?—They were rather livid.

What is the meaning of the expression "hypostatic staining"?—It is the staining which occurs on the back part of the body after death in almost all cases. The colour varies in different cases.

What does your observation tend to show with regard to the hypostatic staining in this case?—It was rather unusually bright.

Tell us something about the colour of the surface of the body and the face?—The colour was reddish brown, rather general on the surface of the body.

What would that be caused by?—Partly as a result of the changes occurring for some time after death, but more likely to

be seen if the surface of the body was flushed or livid at the time of death.

What would such condition of the body at the time of death tend to show?—It would be suggestive of death from asphyxiation.

Without going into details of the various organs of the body, can you say generally what was the condition when you examined them?—The organs generally were fairly healthy, but were congested. There was one exception to that condition in the liver, which showed a condition of advanced fatty disease, which I thought was suggestive of recent alcohol poisoning.

Was there anything in the condition of this body at all which would be indicative of death by natural disease?—No, there was not; and certainly nothing to explain a natural death with symptoms such as this man had been described as having.

You have told us that, having heard the evidence of Dr. Carle, you came to the conclusion as to the death of this man by strychnine poisoning. Was there anything in your examination which tended to confirm that view or otherwise?—Yes; my examination tended rather to confirm it.

Could you just in a sentence say what were the symptoms you found which tended to confirm it?—The very congested condition of the organs, the colour of the blood and its fluidity, and the partial presence of death stiffening, or rigor mortis.

Having completed your post-mortem examination, did you place a number of the organs in some glass jars for the use of Mr. Webster?—I did.

What were these organs?—One bottle contained the remains of the small intestine and contents; another the large intestine and its contents; another contained the liver, both kidneys, and the heart; another contained the spleen; another the pancreas, the sweetbread; another contained the brain and spinal cord; another contained blood from the right side of the chest; and another contained such urine as was found in the bladder. I handed these personally to Mr. Webster.

Cross-examined by Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—You have given us the minimum dose of hydrochloride of strychnine which has proved fatal. Can you give me what the maximum dose is from which you have known recoveries after?—I have known occasional cases which have been recorded where 2, and even 3, grains have been recovered, but I think there are one or two cases quoted in which there have been larger amounts than that.

People have been known to take as much as 2 grains and recover?—Occasionally, yes.

By Mr. Justice Avory—By what means was their recovery effected, do you know, in those cases?—The details are not very clear in some of them. One or two cases have been where pills have been taken and vomiting occurred, and probably a large



[*Photo. by Walter Thomas.*

Mr. H. D. Roome, K.C.

proportion of the poison has been expelled again; but the details of some of the cases are not very clear.

Cross-examination continued—I want you to assume for a minute that, first of all, after Mr. Jones took this dose he spat out of the window; then he went to the lavatory and was sick for a short space of time; then he took something to drink and was sick again. Bearing in mind those facts, if they be correct, should I not be right in saying that with seventeen-thirtieths of a grain of strychnine found upon the organs which was examined, the probability is that he took as much as 2 grains?—Yes; I think that is so, something approaching 2 grains.

And it might be more?—Yes, certainly.

Supposing .12 of a gramme of hydrochloride of strychnine was put into one of those bottles of bromo salts, the bottle containing at the time about two teaspoonfuls of bromo salts, would you find that some of the strychnine would filter through the salts?—It would depend very largely on the condition of the salts in the bottle. If, as sometimes happens in all preparations, the salts had partly effervesced and caked, most of the strychnine might remain on the top.

Assuming that position, first of all—supposing that that had happened to the salts before the strychnine was put into the bottle—of course, the turning up of the bottle for the purpose of taking a dose would alter the position of the salts in the bottle?—Yes.

So that assuming even the condition of the salts which you tell us sometimes happens, and the condition of strychnine, when the bottle would be turned up on its side, that would have the effect of mixing it up?—It would depend upon to what extent it is caked; it might have the effect of causing the strychnine to fall into the most independent part of the bottle, or into the spoon; the strychnine might have come out first.

Suppose it is taken slowly and turned up like that [indicating] that would have the effect, would it not, of turning the bottom of the salts up?—Yes.

The question of the amount of effervescence in these bromo salts depends upon many things, does it not?—Yes, it does.

The shorter the time the bottle had been opened you would expect to find the salts in better condition?—Yes.

Assuming a bottle had been opened for something like a week, and had been corked after it had been used on each occasion with that patent cork, there would be very little deterioration in that case?—No; if the cork were tightened up properly—probably not at all. I am assuming that the cork has not been properly tightened.

Assuming the cork had been put back in the bottle properly it would probably have no effect at all?—No; if it was properly tightened up it would not.

Sir Bernard H. Spilsbury

It is a very simple way of putting the stopper tight, is it not?—Yes.

It is not a matter of screwing; half a turn does it?—Yes.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Is that a cork lining?—It is a patent lining which keeps the air out. I do not think it is cork; I think it is a wax preparation.

Cross-examination continued—As you say, it is a very simple matter screwing it up?—Yes.

Assuming the bottle had only been opened about a week, and the cork was properly put back every time after usage, would that not also affect the condition of the granules and the salts?—It would lead to less impairment of the granules.

You would get less powder at the bottom of the bottle?—That is more due to the degree of shaking of the bottle; it might have been shaken a good deal and also have considerable deposit in the bottle.

That is all a question of degree. You might find practically no powder at the bottom and you might find a good deal?—Yes.

Am I right in saying that this form of strychnine—hydrochloride of strychnine—is apt to stick to the sides of the bottle?—Yes; but it depends largely upon its form, whether the crystals are very fine or large ones.

[Shown exhibit No. 43]—Is that a normal sample?—I should not like to limit this sample to the term normal, because normal ones vary so much.

Is it an average sample?—Yes; I think it is a fairly average sample.

It is quite clear from that average sample that it does stick to the sides of the bottle, as it has there?—Yes.

John Webster, examined by Mr. Roome—I am senior official analyst to the Home Office. On 2nd April of this year Police Constable Cranford handed me six articles, including two sealed glass bottles containing human remains, a blue bottle of bromo salts (exhibit No. 37), a tumbler and spoon (exhibit No. 38), an unopened bottle of bromo salts (exhibit No. 39), and a paper packet containing some crystals (exhibit No. 40). I made an examination of those six articles. One of the two sealed bottles contained a human stomach, and the other a portion of the small intestines. I found in those two bottles traces of strychnine. In exhibit No. 37—that is the bottle of bromo salts—there were a few drops of colourless liquid. I found traces of strychnine in that liquid. I also found traces of strychnine in the tumbler and spoon and the small crystals in the envelope. In the new unopened bottle of bromo salts I did not find any strychnine. On 28th April Sir Bernard Spilsbury handed me eight stoppered glass jars. They contained the organs Sir Bernard Spilsbury mentioned in his evidence. I analysed all those organs. In all of them, with

the exception of the spinal cord, I found traces of strychnine. In the stomach and its contents I found one-fifth of a grain of strychnine.

By Mr. Justice AVORY—Can we not have the total at once?—Seventeen-thirtieths of a grain.

A total of seventeen-thirtieths of a grain?—Yes; apart from minute traces which I could not estimate—minute traces in some of the organs.

Examination continued—That is, in all the organs together, you found seventeen-thirtieths, which is over half a grain?—That is so.

Look at that little phial. [Shown phial produced]—After analysing the contents of the crystals in the envelope did you put the residue left from your analysis in that little phial?—Yes; I transferred them straightway into this little phial and tested a portion of the phial.

Cross-examined by Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—As I understand your evidence, with the minute traces that you found in addition to the traces that you actually measured, there were rather more than seventeen-thirtieths of a grain than under?—Yes; there was just a little over seventeen-thirtieths.

Re-examined by the ATTORNEY-GENERAL—What do you mean by rather more than seventeen-thirtieths?—Do you mean eighteen-thirtieths, or between the two, or more than that?—It is almost impossible to give an actual figure; it would be very small indeed—quite minute.

A minute excess over seventeen-thirtieths?—In my opinion, certainly.

By Mr. Justice AVORY—Not so much as one-thirtieth?—No, I do not think so.

Do you mean the total was not so much as eighteen-thirtieths?—I do not think it would be appreciably more than eighteen-thirtieths.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL—My lord, the accused has made a considerable number of statements, all of which will have to be read. They are not proved by the same witnesses, because they were translated at different times. A formal proof of the translation will have to be given. I suggest that it would be more convenient the statements should be read together at one time after the witnesses have identified them.

Mr. Justice AVORY—Yes.

JOHN JOSEPH DISTARD, examined by Sir EDWARD MARSHALL HALL—I live at The Rowans, Lavender Road, Woking. I am a Belgian, and I speak French. I also understand and speak English. On 30th March, 1924, I was present at the police station, Woking, when the accused, Jean Pierre Vaquier, made a state-

ment in French to the police. I translated it by word of mouth into English as he made it, and Police Constable Russell took it down. The translation which I dictated to Police Constable Russell was, I believe, an accurate translation of what the accused said.

Cross-examined by Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—You would not describe yourself as a very fluent English scholar?—No.

This interview took place at the Woking Police Station?—Yes.

Can you tell me about how long it took?—Yes; about three hours, or three hours and fifteen minutes.

Mr. Justice AVORY—Do you mean the whole process of translating and writing down?—Yes.

Cross-examination continued—Did you translate as the things were said by Vaquier, and was it then at once written down by the officer?—The translation was done to get as much as I could the idea of Vaquier.

I think I understand what you mean by that. See if this is right: you were translating as far as possible to give in English the sense of what Mr. Vaquier had said?—That is so.

You were not translating exactly what he said all the time, were you, but giving the sense of what he said?—I was, as much as I could, translating what he said and respecting the sense of what he said.

Would you just look at the translation?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL—May I interpose in the interests of saving time?—If Sir Henry tells me he does accept this translation, and does not desire it to be put in evidence, I certainly should not put it in. If he desires it to go in, it shall go in. If he would rather not, I will not put it in.

Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—I do not really object to the whole of it, but there are matters which are disputed.

Mr. Justice AVORY—It must either go in as a whole or not at all.

Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—If I might go through it again—perhaps another witness might be called.

Mr. Justice AVORY—Yes.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL—May I say that at any time Sir Henry tells me, before I close my case, I will either read it or not, as he wishes.

Police Constable ARTHUR GRAHAM RUSSELL, examined by Sir EDWARD MARSHALL HALL—I am a police constable stationed at Woking. On 30th March, 1924, I was at the police station when Vaquier made a statement in French and the last witness translated it. He translated it in the third person. I took it down in the first person. [Shown document produced]—That is the document I made on that date. It is an accurate written account of the English that I heard from the last witness.

Evidence for Prosecution.

Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—I should like the statement read, and therefore I must cross-examine Mr. Distard about the few matters I dispute.

JOHN JOSEPH DISTARD, recalled, further cross-examined by Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—I want you to find the sentence which I am just going to refer to in that. "On Mrs. Jones's return to England I accompanied her, as I had a patent I wanted to get on the British market. I travelled with her to Paris and then to England." Do you see that?—Yes.

What I want to know is this: did you intend that it should be written down that Mr. Vaquier had actually travelled from Paris to England with Mrs. Jones, or that he had travelled with her to Paris and then he had come alone to England. Do you remember?—Yes.

Is what I am suggesting right, that he said he had travelled with her as far as Paris, and then he had come alone afterwards to England. Do you remember that?—That was so.

That is right, what I am suggesting?—That is right.

The next paragraph is: "In London I stayed at the Hotel Russell, and whilst there received a wire inviting me to the Blue Anchor, Byfleet"?—What I say was said was, "Sent a wire——"

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL—I accept that.

Cross-examination continued—The next is on the last page: "She found it bitter also and shot the lot from her hand into the fire." What he says is, "Some of it into the fire"?—"Shot the lot from her hand into the fire."

What I suggest he said was: "and shot some of it from her hand into the fire"?—If I remember well, and I think I do, the meaning was that Mrs. Jones had the stuff in her hand and threw the whole thing, or as much as she could, into the fire.

[At this stage the witness gave, to the best of his recollection, the actual language used by the accused upon 30th March.]

Major ALFRED CURZON WATKINS, examined by Mr. ROOME—I am a retired major and I live at Woking. I was present when Superintendent Boshier charged the accused with the murder of Mr. Jones. I translated the charge into French and explained the whole thing to the accused. Superintendent Boshier gave me a caution to administer to the accused before I read the charge. I interpreted the caution to the accused. It was to the effect that he need not say anything unless he liked, and that what he did say would be taken down and might be used in evidence. My words to him were, "You are cautioned that you are not obliged to say anything unless you wish, but anything you do say will be taken down in writing at once." After I had interpreted the charge to the accused, which was to the effect that he was charged with the murder of Alfred George Poynter Jones by administering strychnine, he made a statement in French, and I interpreted what

he said to Superintendent Boshier in English, sentence by sentence. As I interpreted it Superintendent Boshier wrote it down. After the whole of the statement was written down I read it to myself, and then, at the request of Superintendent Boshier, I interpreted it from the English to the accused in French.

And when you interpreted it in French to the accused did the accused say anything?—I forget now whether he said "Yes," or said "Bien."

By Mr. Justice Avory—At all events, he approved it?—He approved.

Harry Ashton Wolfe, examined by Mr. Roome—I am the official interpreter to the Central Criminal Court, London. I translated four statements from French into English. All those translations are correct.

Cross-examined by Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—Would you take exhibit No. 5 and your translation, which is exhibit No. 30. I see that you translated that last paragraph of exhibit No. 5: "But if this bottle which I only had in my hands a few seconds in front of the woman and without moving away from the table," and so on. Is not the proper translation: "Without moving away from the servant" or "Where the servant stood"?—"Without moving away from the drawer where the bottle was put away." That is without looking at my translation.

Just translate that last paragraph?—"But if this bottle which I had in my hands only a few seconds before the woman and without moving away from before the drawer where the bottle was put away and which I put back into this drawer, the woman always being present"——

That is all right. You had got in your first translation, "Without moving away from the table." It ought to be "Without moving away from the drawer," ought it not?—Yes; it should be the drawer; that is quite right; but it must have been a mistake of the typist, because in my written translation I am sure I put "drawer."

Isaac Schonberg, examined by Sir Edward Marshall Hall—I am head of the patent department of the Marconi Company at Marconi House, London. The Marconi Company, I believe, is the chief company in wireless telegraphy in this country.

Is it your business and are you fully acquainted with all the patents dealing with wireless, both in this and other countries?—I cannot say all, but practically everything. I do not know of any part that strychnine plays in the chemistry of wireless telegraphy.

Superintendent Ernest Boshier, examined by the Attorney-General—I am superintendent of police at Woking. At the end of March of this year I was engaged in the taking of statements

from people who had been living at the Blue Anchor Hotel at the time of Mr. Jones's death. On 30th March the accused arrived at the police station, Woking, in a taxi in response to a request from me. When he arrived, there was an interpreter in the room —the witness Distard. I told the interpreter to tell the accused why he was there. I did not offer any inducement to the accused to make a statement, neither did I make any threat to him. The accused made a statement which was translated by the interpreter I have just referred to.

To the best of your belief, was that statement entirely voluntary?—Absolutely.

That is the statement which has been marked exhibit No. 3. On 1st April—that would be the next day but one—did you see the accused again?—I did. The accused handed to me on that date exhibit No. 4 at the Woking Police Station.

How did the accused come to be at the police station on 1st April?—That I forget for the moment now.

Did he come of his own accord?—He came of his own accord. On 6th April he handed me another statement (exhibit No. 6). He also handed that to me at Woking Police Station. He came again of his own accord. On the 11th April he handed me another statement (exhibit No. 6), also at Woking Police Station. He came to the station with it and handed it to me. On 19th April I arrested the accused at the Railway Hotel at Woking, and I charged him, through an interpreter, Major Watkins, with the murder of Alfred George Poynter Jones. He then made a statement which Major Watkins interpreted and which I wrote down myself. That is exhibit No. 7. After arresting the accused, I found, upon searching him, exhibit No. 15, which is the hotel bill at the Hotel Bayonne, where it is alleged the accused stayed, and exhibit No. 26, which was his bill at the Hotel Russell. That is the bill of 16th February. Exhibit No. 28 is the accused's bill at the Hotel Russell for the dinner and the occupation of the bedroom on 3rd March. I also found exhibit No. 32, which was a statement written by him. On the next day I searched the luggage of the accused at Woking Police Station and I found exhibits Nos. 13 and 14, which are the two postcards that were written to the accused abroad by Mrs. Jones. I also found exhibit No. 19, which is the pink paper on which the writing has already been discussed. I also found on the accused exhibit No. 34, which is the bill at the Hotel Palais d'Orsay in Paris. I found on him his passport (exhibit No. 35). In addition to those I found exhibit No. 42, a document with a drawing on the back, which is the alleged prospective hotel at St. Jean de Luz. I bought the new bottle of bromo salts.

Cross-examined by Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—I have been in charge of this case since the beginning. The police were upon the premises very shortly after Mr. Jones's death.

Ernest Boshier

Was any search made at any time of the premises of the Blue Anchor?—Yes.

What date did you think it right to have these premises searched?—Some search was made on the day of the tragedy.

Where was it?—In the bar parlour.

Anywhere else?—No.

When was any other search of the premises of the Blue Anchor made?—At subsequent dates; I am unable to give you the exact dates.

A fortnight or three weeks afterwards?—Some days later.

That would not be much good, would it?—It all depends.

When Vaquier first came to Woking Police Station was he brought there by one of your officers?—He was.

That is on 30th March?—Yes. He was brought there by a plain clothes officer and taken back.

Upon that 30th March can you tell me what other persons were seen by you and statements taken from them in relation to this matter?—Mrs. Fisher, the same day.

Other statements from other people subsequently?—Yes.

I only want the fact; at any time was a statement taken from the gentleman who you knew had been acting as Mrs. Jones's solicitor?—Yes.

Perhaps you had better give me the date of that?—I do not remember the date. That was at Woking Police Station.

The Attorney-General—It is 5th May.

Cross-examination continued—I see that the statement (exhibit No. 4), which was handed to you upon 1st April, and which was written apparently upon 31st March, starts in this way: "By the attitude of the staff of the house and my interrogation of yesterday, I understand at last that I am accused of causing the death of Mr. Jones." Were you the gentleman who had interrogated the accused on the previous day?—Vaquier was dealt with in an exactly similar way to other witnesses.

That does not answer my question, because I do not know how other witnesses were dealt with. Had you interrogated Vaquier?—I put certain questions to the interpreter and asked him to tell Vaquier that statements were being taken from all the persons at the Blue Anchor on 29th March, and would he be good enough to make a full statement as to the time when he first met Mrs. Jones in France, his associations with her, his life at the Blue Anchor, and anything connected with the tragedy as he knew it.

As he went through his statement did you put questions to him for the purpose of clearing up matters?—I did.

Had you said anything to him which would give him to understand that he was accused of causing Mr. Jones's death upon that day?—I could not say anything to him; I was unable to speak in French.

You know quite well what I mean—through the interpreter,

of course—did you say anything to him through the interpreter which could have given him to understand he was accused of causing the death of Mr. Jones?—No.

Was it whilst the accused was in London upon 3rd April that his luggage was removed from the Blue Anchor to the Railway Hotel at Woking?—No.

When was it?—It was about a week after he came to the Railway Hotel; he came there on the 4th, and I believe it was about a week later, anyhow some days, and they were both brought together, the bag and the machine.

Therefore, when he got back from London on 4th April, you say that his luggage was still at the Blue Anchor?—Yes.

Who was it who had him removed from the Blue Anchor to the Railway Hotel?—I suggested it for the man's own comfort and interest.

Who did you suggest it to?—I suggested it over the 'phone.

Who to?—To one of the Whitewicks, I believe it was. It was said that he had gone away, and when he came back I said I would have him at Woking.

That is the day when he had gone up to London?—The day he went to London.

When he came back to the Blue Anchor did he find his luggage had been removed to the Railway Hotel?—It had not been removed then.

When was it removed?—As near as I can say, about a week after 4th April.

Was he told to go to the Railway Hotel without his luggage?—He was brought to Woking in a cab. He was taken to the Railway Hotel, Woking, on 4th April. I tried to get him private lodgings, but failed.

He was taken by the police to the Railway Hotel at Woking?—Yes.

To a room which had been booked for him by you?—The man was without money.

Can you answer my question: to a room which had been booked for him by you?—To the hotel. I never specified any room at all. I asked them to take him in.

I do not suggest you said he must have room 28, or something of that sort, but you asked for a room?—Yes; I asked them to accommodate him.

Then from 4th April until the 11th do you say that he was living at the Railway Hotel at Woking, and that his luggage was still at the Blue Anchor at Byfleet?—I say from the 4th till probably about a week later his things were at Woking, and he was living at the Railway Hotel, Woking.

I suggest to you that the luggage had been removed from the Blue Anchor on 4th April, and that when Vaquier returned to the Blue Anchor he found his luggage had gone?—No.

Ernest Boshier

Did he not have to come to the police station every time he wanted a clean collar or shirt or handkerchief?—He came there many times. He could have taken his bag away, but he preferred to leave it at the police station.

Did you tell him he could take it away?—Yes.

Did he tell you he preferred to leave it there?—He alone had the key.

You told him that in English, did you?—No.

Who did you tell him it through?—I pointed to the bag and indicated he could take it away to the hotel if he so wished.

Mr. Justice AVORY—Is there any point in all this?

Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—Yes; it is upon a search that was made that I am putting this. (*To Witness*)—Having got the luggage finally at the police station, you say on the 11th—I suggest upon the 4th—was any search then made of the luggage?—No.

And although you had engaged his room at the hotel, the luggage remained at the station and he at the hotel?—That is right.

He was arrested on 19th April?—That is right.

Had he been what you may describe as under open arrest before that?—For two days he had been under observation by the police prior to the 19th.

The 17th and 18th?—The 17th and 18th.

Do you say that, although his luggage was at the police station, it was never gone through till after his arrest on the 19th?—That is right.

That is what you say?—I do.

Did you find some sodium acetate and also some cobalt?—I did.

Were they in his bag?—No; at the Blue Anchor Hotel.

By the side of the wireless, were they?—In the room.

In the bar parlour?—Yes.

On a table close to the wireless set?—Yes.

Of course, they have been in your possession since that time?—Yes; they are here to-day.

Up till 17th April, at any rate, the accused was free to go and come as he pleased?—Yes.

No steps were taken to prevent him moving?—None at all.

And in fact he remained either at the Blue Anchor or at the Railway Hotel all that time?—He remained at the Railway Hotel from the 4th until his arrest on the 19th.

He remained from the date of the death either at the Blue Anchor or at the Railway Hotel until his arrest?—That is right.

Up till the 17th no steps of any sort were taken to keep him there?—No.

Re-examined by the ATTORNEY-GENERAL—Did the chemist, Mr. Bland, make a communication to the police?—Yes.

What was the date when Mr. Bland first made that communication?—I believe it was 17th April.

Was it before or after Mr. Bland made his communication that the accused was first kept under observation?—After.

Before that day—and, of course, from the moment or shortly after the death—was it apparent to you there would be an inquest?—Yes.

Was it desirable, in your opinion, that the people in the house should be available to give evidence in case of need at the inquest?—Most essential.

You told us you tried to get the accused a room before you went to the Railway Hotel, but could not manage it. What was the difficulty?—Because he was a Frenchman and unable to speak English.

The Attorney-General—My lord, all that remains now is the series of statements. I do not know whether your lordship thinks it convenient to read them to the jury alternately in order of date?

Mr. Justice Avory—Yes.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—Might the accused have the French originals?

Sir Edward Marshall Hall—The first one, dated 30th March (exhibit No. 3) is the dictated one. Perhaps after I have read it to the jury the interpreter would read it to the accused?

Mr. Justice Avory—Yes.

Sir Edward Marshall Hall—He may have the others, certainly, because they are in his writing.

Mr. Justice Avory—I think that will be the convenient plan.

Sir Edward Marshall Hall—We can do better than that; we can have a translation made into French and handed to the accused during the interval.

The Attorney-General—Might I suggest that the accused should have the opportunity of reading his statement at some time, and therefore it might be desirable that a translation should be made and handed to him during the adjournment.

Mr. Justice Avory—Very well.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—I am quite content.

First Statement by the Accused.

Sir Edward Marshall Hall—The first one is the 30th March, 1924 (exhibit No. 3): "I was born at Niort, Department Aude, France, on the 14th July, 1879. I am married, but living apart from my wife. We had a mutual agreement to separate in 1920.

"I first met Mrs. Jones in the early part of February this year at the Hotel Victoria, Biarritz. At the time I was giving lectures on radio-telephony at Biarritz, and I made her acquaintance at one of these lectures that she attended. She told me that

she had left England owing to her bankruptcy, and was on a circular tour taking in Pau, Lourdes, and return to Biarritz. I did not accompany her on this tour, but saw her again on her return. It was generally known at the hotel that Mrs. Jones was a married woman. My relations with her were only that of a friend. We certainly did not cohabit.

"As a lecturer on radio-telephony, I stay at Biarritz four months in the year, and for the remainder tour France. On Mrs. Jones's return to England I accompanied her, as I had a patent that I wanted to get on the British market. I travelled with her to Paris and thence to England. To be able to do this I got my passport through in twenty-four hours. I paid all her expenses on the journey as an act of courtesy, as she was travelling with me. Arrived in England on 18th February, 1924.

"In London I stayed at the Hotel Russell, and whilst there received a wire inviting me to the Blue Anchor, Byfleet. I arrived at the Blue Anchor on the 17th February, 1924, and met Mr. Jones (the deceased). He was ill at the time. Soon after Mr. Jones asked me if I could oblige him with a loan, and on the 19th February I advanced him £108. On the 21st February I also paid him £22 as a deposit against my bill for board and lodging at the hotel.

"As I was unable to dispose of my patent, and wished to return to France, on the 25th March I asked for the return of my money. Mr. Jones told me to oblige him by waiting another ten or fifteen days. So far as I know, Mrs. Jones was not aware of the transaction. I was rather worried about this money, as Mr. Jones was often sending to the bank at Kingston.

"I went to bed on Friday, the 28th March, at 11 p.m. At that time there were four or five persons in the hotel besides myself. I only knew one of them, a young man of about twenty, who owes Mr. Jones some money. At twelve midnight I went downstairs for some matches. I wanted these matches to enable me to smoke. I often smoke in the night, as I suffer from sleeplessness. When I got downstairs I found Mrs. Jones asleep in a chair in the bar parlour. Mr. Jones was also there, very lightly clad. On the table there were about forty empty glasses, and amongst them a blue bottle of bromo salts. I asked Mr. Jones if he had been unwell. He replied, 'No; why?' I pointed out the bottle on the table. Mr. Jones then said, 'Oh, I never take them at night, but in the morning.' There were four or five other persons in the bar besides Mr. and Mrs. Jones. I went back to bed after getting the matches.

"I got up at 7 a.m. on Saturday morning. I am an early riser, and am always up at 7 a.m., or earlier. While at the Blue Anchor I was always up first, and used to get myself coffee and go for a walk before breakfast. I noticed that the glasses were still on the table. Mrs. Jones came downstairs at 8 a.m., and was

followed by Mr. Jones at about 9 a.m. The bottle of bromo salts was on the mantelpiece. Jones had his back towards me when he drank the dose. I heard him exclaim that it was bitter. Mrs. Jones then emptied the bottle into her hand and tasted it by moistening her finger. She found it bitter also, and shot the lot from her hand into the fire. She wholly emptied the contents of the bottle into her hand. I tried to stop her from throwing them into the fire by shouting 'Stop: save them for the doctor,' but was too late. She tried to rub some particles which still adhered to her palm back into the bottle, after which she took the bottle away to the kitchen. Mrs. Jones had then gone to the lavatory. I afterwards helped the manager, George, to get him to bed.

"I am a small drinker. I have on two occasions helped Mr. Jones to bed as he was drunk. I have never known him to vomit as a result of having too much to drink.

"I have often heard Mr. and Mrs. Jones quarrelling in their bedroom. One morning, after having a terrific quarrel, Mrs. Jones went off and I and others thought that she would commit suicide. Mr. Jones was not kind to her and treated her badly." That is the first statement.

Second Statement by the Accused.

Mr. Roome—Exhibit No. 29 is the second statement—exhibit No. 4 in French and exhibit No. 29 in English. This is the statement which was brought to the police station at Woking by the accused on 1st April: "Blue Anchor Hotel, Byfleet, Surrey. By the attitude of the staff of the house and my interrogation of yesterday I understand at last that I am accused of causing the death of Mr. Jones. This man, to whom I was attached, and whom I loved like a brother, is the victim of a coward, jealous of my presence here.

"Mr. Jones was not in the least jealous of me, and for a very good reason. But others found my presence embarrassing. I insisted on Mr. and Mrs. Jones being treated with respect, and this did not please the regular clients of this house of pleasure.

"I say that if the poison which killed Mr. Jones was not put in his glass by the criminal himself (involuntary criminal, perhaps), it was put there by a servant in the pay of this cowardly suitor with the object, according to me, a foreigner, to have me accused of this horrible tragedy.

"I was not jealous of Mr. Jones. I had no right to be, for no intimate relations existed between myself and Mrs. Jones here, and I can say that if ever so cowardly and criminal an idea could have been born in my brain it would have been much easier for me to rid myself of Mr. Jones in the evening when no one was present, and when Mr. Jones was blind drunk.

"I should never have poured poison into a bottle that was at every one's disposal with the risk of killing any one.

"For eight days I had only been wanting one thing, to go away again with my money, for Mr. Jones, whom I had requested to give me back my little fortune, told me that my presence at the Blue Anchor drove away the regular clients, and that I interfered a little too much with matters that did not concern me (alluding to the respect I insisted on being shown to Mrs. Jones).

"Once more I say that the poison was introduced Saturday between eleven o'clock at night, at which hour I went to bed, and Sunday morning seven o'clock, at which hour I came down to the kitchen. This coward, if he committed this crime so as to obtain the estate of Mr. and Mrs. Jones, was certainly ignorant of the fact that the hotel is in the name of Mr. Jones, that Mrs. Jones is a bankrupt, and that everything, in the event of Mr. Jones's death, was to pass, one-half to Mrs. Jones and one-half to the children. But Mrs. Jones had still liabilities of £2000, and the creditors have a claim on what comes to Mrs. Jones. This means that Mrs. Jones possesses nothing. If lucre guided the hand of this cowardly assassin, he made a mistake, or else, to get rid of two men just to satisfy his passion and to have me accused of a crime, that I should not commit even if quite mad. I have never told Mr. Jones of a great love for Mrs. Jones as others have taken the liberty of doing. (Mrs. Jones had written this to me, but she insisted that I should return to her some compromising friendly things that she had written to me.)

"It is among these suitors that it is possible to find the cowardly assassin who makes the suspicion of having committed the most terrible and the most cowardly murder ever perpetrated hover over an honest man.

"This morning the doors are locked but the windows open, unusual precautions, and quite unnecessary for me, for a man who has nothing to reproach himself with does not try to run away.

"If Mrs. Jones would speak, she alone can perhaps know him, who has every interest to get rid of me and Mr. Jones. The attitude of Mrs. Jones towards me is inexplicable. Yesterday morning, coming up the stairs and whilst I was in the kitchen, Mrs. Jones, who was accompanied, shook her fist at me, saying words that I do not understand. The gesture is significant, it is accusing. In the evening Mrs. Jones agrees to have a drink with me and the detectives; she invites me to come and chat in the parlour, and comes to dine with me and her son.

"About sixteen o'clock (4 p.m.) she came into the dining-room with several persons and gave me to understand that I was to leave the house, saying to me 'Baggages.' This hurt me very much, and I went for a walk with the dog. In the evening I returned to my room and packed my bag, carried it down, and asked the waiter (potman) to 'phone for a taxi.

"Coming down I met the detectives, who asked me to remain.

And then Mrs. Jones came to tell me, in the presence of the detectives, that she never told me to leave. Mrs. Jones denied having told me that, no doubt on the advice of her lover; this would suggest that I was taking flight. It was the same evening that I accompanied Mrs. Jones, against her wish, to her lawyer (the day or two days before the hearing at the Court at Kingston); that Mrs. Jones, whom I had threatened to leave even at Waterloo Station unless I went with her to her lawyer, said to me in the Waterloo Subway that, in view of my jealousy, all friendship between us was at an end, that all was over, and that I might return to Byfleet and to France. I decided then to accompany Mrs. Jones, and, until we arrived at the house of the lawyer, we did not say a single word. We went to have tea with her lover at six o'clock and returned to Byfleet. It was this solicitor clerk who accompanied a servant to the police station yesterday. It was the same gentleman who told Mr. Jones that he madly loved his wife. Stated by Mr. Jones and also by Mrs. Jones to me. Mrs. Jones had written me this, but this paper, like the others, disappeared into the fire. The wife of the waiter (potman) begged me one day in the kitchen, before the other woman, to get her a good situation in Biarritz. On my consenting, I understood that this woman was satisfied. In the evening, about midnight, I told Mr. Jones of it, and expressed my astonishment at the woman's leaving her husband. Mr. Jones told me that George would never leave the Blue Anchor, even if he earned £5 a day in France, and would say no more, notwithstanding my insistence. I understood!

"What is the motive that makes Mrs. Jones accuse me of the death of her husband? Under what impulse is she acting? Can she say that I have ever uttered a threat against her husband, whom I was very fond of, as he was very kind-hearted, and with whom I had decided to go to France? Mr. Jones was enthusiastic about selling the hotel and coming to St. Jean de Luz to run a hotel together. Mr. Jones was hurt that Mrs. Jones was not as decided about leaving as he was, and, in view of the failure of the sale of my patent, I decided to return to France alone, and Friday evening, the evening before his death, I again asked him to give me my money, as I wished to take advantage of the rate of exchange. Mr. Jones asked me to wait about ten days, and that he then would be able to do so. Now, Mr. Jones often has money carried to the bank, and again Saturday, the employee went to Kingston with some; I myself noticed it, and wondered why then he made me wait ten or fifteen days more. I say that Mrs. Jones is thoughtless. It is for her that the crime has been committed. Notwithstanding that she sometimes suffered from the want of affection and bestiality caused by the jealousy of Mr. Jones, she did not wish him any harm. And never in my presence has she uttered any word of hatred. Notwithstanding also that Mrs. Jones wrote a letter to her husband (which letter I had not seen,

but which Mrs. Jones's lover has had or has in his possession), and notwithstanding also that Mrs. Jones, following upon that letter, returned her wedding ring to Mr. Jones, which ring she took back later, Mrs. Jones never uttered a word of hatred to me against her husband. She is totally incapable of it.

"She is a very kind and impressionable woman, over whom certain persons have a bad influence. She is the unconscious instrument of the misfortune which has befallen her, she and her dear children.

"Why and with what object should I have committed this horrible crime? I am not a drunkard.

"It is not, as one may suppose, out of jealousy, because Mrs. Jones had no longer any affection for me for some time. It is not either for pecuniary reasons. Mrs. Jones was in great difficulties, I was well aware of this; even assuming, as is thought, that I was jealous, it was not of him or against him that I should have a reason for revenge. It is against his friends whom I should have slighted and eliminated, not removed as Mr. Jones has been removed. For me it is an immeasurable misfortune to find myself here at this moment, and my friendship and affection that I had for Mr. Jones is changed to wrath, and I hate Mr. Jones for not having given me back my money before. Perhaps if I had left and not been in the way any longer, the crime would not have been committed. I reproach Mrs. Jones with not having let me leave when I several times informed her of my pain at her having withdrawn her friendship. Always Mrs. Jones said to me: You leave, never. (*Vous partez jamais.*) Let the spirit of my dear Jones arise and loudly proclaim my innocence. He alone knows that I am not guilty. Let him tell Mrs. Jones that it is not I; and Mrs. Jones herself, notwithstanding her unjustified anger, is well aware that I loved Mr. Jones too much for her to accuse me with such terrible insistence. I forgive her, for it is not she who accuses me.

"Evening, eighteen o'clock (6 p.m.). About a fortnight ago the gentleman who yesterday accompanied the servant to the police station came with another employee as always. In the small parlour on the ground floor there were five or six persons, amongst them was Mr. Jones, I was sitting in the armchair which is in front of the writing desk. Mrs. Jones was in the armchair opposite, two metres from Mrs. Jones the person in question sitting on a chair, and three or four persons on the sofa. Mr. Jones was next to me and chatted with the other people. From my position I had therefore Mrs. Jones and this gentleman in full view. What did the look signify that Mrs. Jones and he exchanged and which lasted almost a minute? The eyes were fixed and wide open without winking; this scene was noticed by Mr. Jones, and also no doubt by others. The gentleman in the interval threw a rapid glance towards Mr. Jones.

Sir Edward Marshall Hall, K.C.

"Far be it from me to accuse this gentleman, but this now comes back to me and seems strange to me. I remarked as much to Mrs. Jones, who was never able to tell me the meaning of that long and exaggerated stare.

"You can say, gentlemen, that other persons told you about it, and Mrs. Jones will not deny it. It was after Mrs. Jones had appeared at Court with her creditors. That same day Mr. and Mrs. Jones went upstairs to the drawing-room with this gentleman. I consider that this gentleman, who felt it necessary to make a statement against me or to undertake certain steps against me, and who has declared his love for Mrs. Jones, may know something."

Third Statement by the Accused.

Sir Edward Marshall Hall—The next statement is 6th April (exhibit No. 30 in English, which is a translation of exhibit No. 5 in French): "I have already stated that Mr. Jones had informed me that George, the potman, would never leave the Blue Anchor, even should he make £5 a day elsewhere, why?

"I think that the second act of the drama will be the disappearance of the wife of George, as mysteriously and also as tragically as Mr. Jones. Or else, this woman will have to continue to share her husband with some one else, which does not seem to please her, since she wishes to leave the Blue Anchor and her husband.

"George has an incontestable and considerable ascendancy over that unhappy defenceless woman (Mrs. Jones). Mrs. Jones gives the money to the potman, and he takes it to his room. This is never done.

"On the 2nd April Mrs. Jones, whom I was asking, without getting her to understand, to look for the receipt for the money lent by her husband (which she has not yet done, and which is very important to me)—Mrs. Jones, I say, was the first to call in Mr. Schulte (interpreter), and she herself wrote out the telegram before a lady, who carried it to the post office.

"Mr. Schulte came the day before yesterday. We were in my room, and three times I told the servant to tell Mrs. Jones to come.

"Who gave the order to this very obedient woman not to obey? George.

"Five minutes were passed in unimportant chatting, and Mrs. Jones went down on the pretext that her uncle was there and that she was coming back at once.

"Nearly an hour passed, I was impatient and went down to the kitchen, and saw Mrs. Jones with two or three servants who had received very strict orders.

"Who forbade Madame Jones to come upstairs again to the interpreter and myself? George.

"I returned to my room to Mr. Schulte, and we waited another three-quarters of an hour. I then asked Mr. Schulte to go and tell Mrs. Jones, still in the same kitchen, that she had sent for him needlessly, and that he was going back. And in fact he obtained the payment for his journey and went.

"Ten times, twenty times, I asked the servant to tell Mrs. Jones that I desired to explain myself to her on the subject of what worried me most, my money, the receipt; my messages are never given to her. It is always George who intercepts them and forbids that Mrs. Jones should be told.

"Yesterday about 4 p.m., returning from London, I gave one of the servants two postcards of no importance that she had sent to me to Lourdes. I requested the servant to hand them at once to Mrs. Jones.

"What did the servant do? She hurried and gave them to George, who read them in the dining-room just as I entered. I observed to him that they were to have been given to Mrs. Jones and not to him. In reply he put them in his pocket; the servant was present. Why did the servant give everything concerning Mrs. Jones to George rather than to her mistress?

"Who intercepts and suppresses Mrs. Jones's correspondence, even when Mrs. Jones was there? George.

"One letter and one postcard addressed to Mrs. Jones disappeared from the correspondence. Mrs. Jones never received them, and says nothing. She so quick-tempered, no outburst of temper, for she fears and she knows.

"I desire ardently that Mrs. Jones should be asked to come so that we might have an explanation once and for all regarding what she pretends to have paid for me, and to ask of her that she will decide to make investigations and to give to her the description of the person to whom Mr. Jones lent the money. It is inadmissible that Mrs. Jones does not know this person.

"I am alone and defenceless against every one; advantage has been taken of my presence here to get rid of a man who only wished to live and to blame on to me, a foreigner, whom no one considers any longer and whom every one accuses, all the weight of this abominable and monstrous crime.

"I unfortunately do not understand English, but I have understood for a long time what is taking place in this house of assignation where women permanently there were used to attract men drunken with desire. Things happened in there that are unknown in brothels, and the police would often make good hauls there. And I will always say even if misfortune follows me, as it has so far done, I will always say everywhere, before my judges, if I am to go before them, that the assassin, this cowardly criminal,

is still at the Blue Anchor. And this awful person has an accomplice, male or female.

"I am firm on this point, on the condition that the bottle was washed, as I have been asked at the police station. If the bottle was not washed there is no accomplice, for Mr. Jones, spitting out the water, could have introduced some into the bottle which was on the table.

"But if this bottle which I only had in my hands a few seconds in front of the woman and without moving away from in front of the drawer"—that has been agreed—"where the bottle was put away and which I replaced in this drawer still in the presence of the woman, and this bottle was washed before or after I saw and touched it, then there is an accomplice, male or female, for everybody, even people who have no business there, always go into this kitchen."

Fourth Statement by the Accused.

Mr. Roome—The next is exhibit No. 31; it is exhibit No. 6 in French: "That which I have already said, and which I complete by what follows, should make it sufficiently clear, that I am an absolute stranger to this odious crime, and set aside the slightest suspicion against me.

"I affirm, and I will prove that if I had had any criminal intention regarding Mr. Jones, I had means and opportunities that the scoundrel had not, and of which he would not have failed to take advantage if he had been in my place.

"(1) Twice I carried Mr. Jones dead drunk upstairs in my arms, and I left him before the door of his room, where the unhappy Mrs. Jones took him and put him to bed.

"One evening especially Mr. Jones arrived from Kingston with three regular clients of the house. Mr. Jones was quite drunk, but was sufficiently lucid to say that there were two women in the house. It was then (and Mrs. Jones bore me malice for this) that I insisted on Mrs. Jones being treated with respect, for I understood that they said that there were three of them and that there were only two women. Then one of the three, whom since then I have indicated to Mrs. Jones, said this: 'Oh, but there is Mrs. Jones,' and it was owing to my indignant look that they understood that the thing was impossible. Mr. Jones two or three days after wrote me a letter saying that I mixed myself in matters that did not concern me. I understood.

"And when all three had satisfied their vice on these two women and had left, it was then Mr. Jones, after having emptied two more glasses of whisky, was completely incapable of closing the doors and going upstairs. Once more I took him in my arms and carried him to his room.

"What would have been easier for me, if I had had any intention of harming Mr. Jones, to then get rid of a man in the state that he was?

"It would have been very easy for me to take a bottle of whisky and get him to drink it without forcing him, for he desired nothing better than to continue to drink, and without any poison, without hurting him in any way, without anything, he would have died stifled by the alcohol. It would have been more human in my estimation than the use of any corrosive that causes horrible suffering, and, above all, would not have been compromising for me.

"Twenty times I could have had the opportunity of doing this, for I remained alone with him until two or three in the morning.

"(2) I was not aware that he had taken both his motor cars to London (or elsewhere) to sell them (I saw these two cars go off with number plates lent by friends). I should have waited until he had realised on these.

"(3) I should have waited also till he had sold his hotel, as he had decided to do (he had been offered three thousand pounds).

"(4) And I should also have waited until he had obtained the return of over £800 that he had lent, and which, in view of our pending departure for France, he was going to demand the reimbursement.

"I should patiently and surely have waited for all that, and should not have had any reason to precipitate events in a manner so tragic, and act brutally and cowardly as was done. It would have been the act of a madman if I had so acted.

"I enjoyed the esteem and the confidence of Mr. and Mrs. Jones; I loved them as one does a brother and a sister, since it was decided that we should become partners and live together. When the business was realised, Mr. Jones would have had about the following:—

Sale of hotel, - - - - - -	£3000
Loan, doctor of Brooklands, - - -	500
To M. M., - - - - - -	100
Sale of two cars, - - - - -	200?
Bank deposit, - - - - -	500
	£4300

This to show you that I knew all Mr. Jones's affairs, because both of them, with Mrs. Jones, had repeatedly talked about them to me.

"By the death of Mr. Jones, Mrs. Jones gets nothing of all this."

Fifth Statement by the Accused.

"I say and affirm that Mrs. Jones is absolutely innocent, and no doubt is possible.

"One day after a scene (I never understood about what) Mrs. Jones went to her room to give full vent to her unhappiness.

"I went to the kitchen and asked the two servants what had happened. One of them (the younger) wrote on a piece of paper on the kitchen table in English the following, which I afterwards translated: 'With such a man I should not stay long.'

"That evening I saw Mrs. Jones, who was still in deep trouble, and advised her not to live like this, but once for all to leave Mr. Jones.

"Mrs. Jones wrote the following which I translated: 'I always suffer, I have never done wrong, not leave Mr. Jones, I have children.'

"Another time Mrs. Jones went away in tears; I thought that in a moment of despair she might have gone to drown herself.

"I went to look for her with a servant. She came back (Mrs. Jones) towards fifteen o'clock, and when I communicated my fears to her she answered this, 'Me destroy myself, never, I always forgive Mr. Jones because he has drunk. A woman is made to suffer.'

"At Biarritz, at the Victoria Hotel, when she received a letter from Mr. Jones she was so happy that the tears came to her eyes, and when she received the telegram telling her to come back at once she was very happy.

"No one could say that Mrs. Jones did not love her husband, for any other woman would not have put up with what she suffered.

"I do not know Mrs. Jones's past, but, however bad it may be, Mrs. Jones is absolutely ignorant, in my opinion, of all the plotting going on about and for her. I repeat again and always say that the directing brains of this plots are in the Blue Anchor itself or in London, and it will be seen later if my suspicions have any foundation.

"What makes me say this is that I understand since the last few days that the inquiry gravitates around Mrs. Jones and myself only, that is to say beside the truth."

Statement by the Accused on Arrest.

Mr. Roome—Then exhibit No. 7 is the accused's statement on arrest: "No reply. I expected it. All the suspicions have been against me. I assure you that on the tomb of my mother I am innocent, and that I will make known to-morrow he who administered the poison. He who had the poison bought, since the first day all suspicion is against me, and if I said nothing it was that I had the firm conviction that the police would have discovered the culprit, but as I am now accused to-morrow without fail I will tell the truth. I beg of you and you will see to-morrow, do not put me in prison if you can help it. I prefer to die, you will see I am not guilty."

The Attorney-General—My lord, that is the case for the Crown.

Jean Pierre Vaquier.

Evidence for the Defence.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—My lord, I call the accused at once. My friend Mr. Lucy will examine him.

Jean Pierre Vaquier (prisoner on oath), examined by Mr. Lucy, through the interpreter (Mr. Ashton Wolfe)—My name is Jean Pierre Vaquier, and I am forty-five years of age. I was born at Niort, in the district of Limoux, the Department of Aude, in France. Since I left school I have worked at mechanics and electricity. I was married in 1902, and I divorced my wife in 1919. During the war I was in the 8th Regiment of Engineers as a telephonist. I was demobilised in 1919. I have never had any criminal proceedings brought against me in my life. I first met Mrs. Jones in the middle of January, 1924, when I was at the Hotel Victoria, Biarritz, where I was acting as a wireless operator on my own account. Mrs. Jones left the Hotel Victoria and went to Pau and Lourdes and afterwards returned to the Hotel Victoria. I then went to stay with her, first of all at the Hotel du Palais, and then at the Hotel Bayonne, Biarritz. During that time we stayed together as husband and wife. We then went to Bordeaux, to the Terminus Hotel. I always paid the bill. Then we went to the Palais d'Orsay Hotel, Paris. When in Paris we went to a place called Sens. The object of our going there was to obtain a model of my invention which was at the Tribunal of Commerce.

[At this stage the machine in question was produced.]

By Mr. Justice Avory—What was this patent for?—To mince meat.

Examination continued—I do not remember the precise date that Mrs. Jones left for England. I came to England on 8th February, and I went to the Hotel Russell. That was on the recommendation of Mrs. Jones. On 12th February I sent a telegram to Mr. and Mrs. Jones at the Blue Anchor, and I received a telephone reply. I do not know what the message was, but it was translated to me, and it was to the effect, "You are asked to remain here till six o'clock." I waited, and at six o'clock Mrs. Jones arrived alone. We dined at the hotel and I saw her off to Byfleet that same night. An arrangement was made before she went that she was to come back the next day.

Was anything said about your going to Byfleet?—Yes, absolutely, since my stay in France.

And the next day you saw Mrs. Jones at lunch?—Yes.

Then she missed her train that night?—Yes.

And she stayed with you that night?—Yes.

By Mr. Justice Avory—In the same bed?—Yes.

Examination continued—[Shown exhibit No. 18, cheque]—Tell me when that cheque was given to you by Mrs. Jones?—It was given to me at the Hotel Russell after dinner.

On what date?—It was two or three days before I paid the hotel.

Before you went to Byfleet?—Yes.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Was it on this night of the 13th February, the night she stayed?—Yes.

Examination continued—You went down to Byfleet on 14th February?—Yes.

Was that by arrangement?—Yes.

With whom?—With Mrs. Jones.

Did you stay down at Byfleet until 16th February?—Yes.

Was Mr. Jones there then?—Yes.

On the 16th?—When I arrived at Byfleet Mr. Jones was not there.

When did you first see Mr. Jones?—The day after the day of my arrival.

Had you been to the Hotel Russell in the meantime?—Yes.

When you first saw Mr. Jones was anything said about staying at the hotel?—No.

Why were you going to stay at the Blue Anchor?—As it was less expensive, and I had arranged with Mrs. Jones to stay there whilst waiting for the sale of my patent.

I want to get from you your ordinary custom when living at the Blue Anchor. What time was it your rule to get up in the morning?—Six o'clock every morning. I then went downstairs and prepared some coffee, and then I went for a walk up to about eight o'clock.

What time would you have breakfast?—Immediately after returning.

Did you use to do any writing in the morning?—Yes; every morning in the dining-room.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Is that the room which was called the coffee-room?—The room of the restaurant.

Examination continued—Was your breakfast taken there?—Yes.

Alone?—Alone.

What time did Mr. and Mrs. Jones use to come down?—Ten o'clock, eleven o'clock.

What time was luncheon served?—One or two o'clock.

Who would be present at that meal?—We generally lunched together, Mr. and Mrs. Jones and myself.

Then at dinner who was present?—I and Mrs. Jones.

What about Mr. Jones?—Mr. Jones only ate very lightly, and mostly did not eat at all in the evening.

After dinner what used to happen?—The customers would arrive.

Till what time would they remain?—Midnight, one or two o'clock.

As a rule, what time used you to go to bed?—Ten o'clock or eleven o'clock at the latest.

How did you use to sleep?—Very badly.

Why?—I was suffering from insomnia.

Did you use to take anything for insomnia?—I used to breathe chloroform—inhale chloroform.

Were you on friendly terms with Mr. Jones?—Yes, very.

I want now to come to when he was ill. Three days after your arrival did you see him in his bedroom?—Yes.

Did you have a conversation with him?—Yes.

Was anybody else present?—Yes.

Who was it?—A man whom I do not know.

Can you give me his description?—Yes; he was about sixty years old, well dressed. He seemed to be the possessor of an estate, a man of means.

Did Mr. Jones tell you his name?—No.

How did he introduce you or speak to him?—He simply said, a friend.

Did you have some conversation with Mr. Jones?—Yes.

Did Mr. Jones speak French?—I understood him.

Did he speak French a little?—Yes, a little.

Will you tell me what conversation Mr. Jones had with you?—I sat down, the stranger offered drinks, which the servant brought upstairs, and during the conversation Mr. Jones asked me to do him a service.

What was the service he asked you to do him?—He asked me for £200—if I could lend him £200.

What did you say to that?—I replied that I did not possess it on myself at the time.

Did you offer to lend him any money?—What I possessed at the time.

How much was that?—I had about £150 on me.

By Mr. Justice Avory—In your pocket at that time?—Yes.

Examination continued—How much in fact did you lend that day?—£106.

When you handed this £106 to Mr. Jones did he say anything to you?—He said he would give me a receipt as soon as he was better.

Have you ever received a receipt from him?—No, never.

Was there anything else on the table?—Yes.

What?—There was about £20 on the table.

By Mr. Justice Avory—In what form?—Bank notes.

Examination continued—What happened to this money?—He gave the £106, which was mine, as well as the £20 on the table, to this man.

Did you at that time tell Mrs. Jones that you had lent him any money?—No; because Mr. Jones asked me not to say so.

The day after you lent him this £106 did you give anything

else to Mr. Jones?—Yes; I gave him £22 to keep for me, to take care of for me.

I now want to ask you what money you brought over with you from France?—From 20,000 to 22,000 francs; rather more than less.

Where did this money come from?—By the sales of radio telephonic apparatus.

Can you give me some details of the amount you had received for the sale of this wireless apparatus?—Roughly, yes, not in detail. I transformed a Rolls-Royce car apparatus for a Spanish gentleman.

About what did you receive for that?—Six thousand francs, about. I will have to see my notes.

Did you sell some sets as well?—I sold one apparatus of wireless telephony to Mr. Adeline, in Biarritz.

In any other places?—Yes.

About what prices were these?—Pathé Brothers apparatus about 3000 francs.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Is this all included in the 22,000 francs?—Probably more.

Examination continued—Some four days after Mr. Jones got better from his illness did you go for a walk with him?—Yes.

Was anything said about your loan?—Yes.

What was said?—I wished that he would give me my money back.

Why?—Because I wished to return to France.

Why?—I had not succeeded in selling my patent, and I wished to take advantage of the rate of exchange.

What did Mr. Jones say to that?—He asked me to wait about a fortnight.

Shortly before Mr. Jones died did you ask him anything about your loan?—I spoke to him about it three times.

When was the last occasion?—Two or three days before his death.

Have you ever received any of that money?—Never.

During the whole of your stay at Byfleet did Mr. Jones ever complain to you about your conduct regarding his wife?—Never.

Did he in fact at one time suggest your taking her to a theatre?—It was he himself who had asked it.

And you took her?—Yes.

At the Blue Anchor did you ever have connection with Mrs. Jones?—No.

During the last week of Mr. Jones's life was there any mention of the Villa Merien?—Yes.

What did you tell him about it; what was discussed regarding this?—It was decided that he would realise on his hotel, his motor car, and that he would call in the loans that he had made.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Who suggested this idea of the Villa Merien, St. Jean de Luz?—I did so.

Examination continued—Who was to go there?—All three of us.

Was Mr. Jones pleased with this proposition?—He was happier about it than Mrs. Jones.

When were the plans shown?—Four or five days before his death.

[Shown plans]—Are those the plans?—Yes.

Did you draw them up yourself?—Roughly, yes.

When did you first tell Mrs. Jones about the loan you had made to her husband?—I spoke to her about it after the death of Mr. Jones.

Did not you speak to her before about it?—No.

How did Mr. and Mrs. Jones get on together?—Publicly, well; in their intimacy, no.

Did you notice at the Blue Anchor any one whom Mrs. Jones was particularly fond of?—Specially fond of, no.

Was there any one who used to come and see her regularly?

Mr. Justice Avory—"Come to see her." Just explain what you mean.

Examination continued—Come to the hotel regularly?—There were customers who came every day.

Anybody in particular?

Mr. Justice Avory—Do you mean somebody who came more than every day, or what?

Examination continued—On a Sunday particularly, we will say?—Yes; one person specially on Sundays.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Do you mean there was only one person who came on Sunday?—This person came specially on Sundays.

Does that mean he came only on Sunday?—Yes.

Examination continued—Who was this?—It was the solicitor of Mrs. Jones.

Did Mr. Jones ever speak to you about the solicitor——

Mr. Justice Avory—How is this evidence?

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—We are entitled to have the conversation—I put it in cross-examination to Mrs. Jones—which had taken place between the deceased man and the accused in relation to this solicitor who has just been mentioned. Your lordship may remember I cross-examined Mrs. Jones, and your lordship made a comment at the moment I did so asking me what the age of the man was.

Mr. Justice Avory—Yes.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—It is upon that point.

Mr. Justice Avory—The mere fact that you cross-examined on some fact does not make evidence on that fact admissible.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—I submit I am entitled to have a

conversation which took place between the deceased man and the accused in relation to a person who was visiting at that hotel.

Mr. Justice AVORY—I do not see on what ground. On what ground do you suggest some statement made by the deceased person ——

Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—It is difficult to anticipate the materiality of it until your lordship hears a little more of the accused's story. Perhaps my friend might postpone the particular question until he has asked one or two more questions, which I think will show the materiality of the question.

Mr. Justice AVORY—Very well, we will see.

Examination continued—During your stay at Byfleet how many times did you go to London?—Five or six times.

For what reason were you going to London?—I went to see firms who were negotiating for the buying of my patent.

Did you go to visit a chemist, Mr. Bland?—I went to see him at first when I was at the Russell.

What were you buying then?—Toilet articles.

Did you buy certain chemicals as well?—Yes.

What sort of things were there?—I only bought chemicals when I was at the Blue Anchor.

Such things as oxide of tin?—The first time I bought acetate of tin, nitrate of silver, acetate of copper, cobalt, and iron oxide.

What were these chemicals for?—They were to serve for experiments in wireless telephony.

What sort of quantities did you use to order?—The first time small quantities.

I want to take you now straight to the 1st March. Did you go up to London on that day?—Yes.

Did you hand a list into the chemist's of anything?—Yes.

What was on the list?—It was a list I had made out at the Russell; it was about 100 grammes of each.

Of what?—Acetate of cobalt, acetate of silver—no—nitrate of silver, and copper oxide.

Anything else?—25 grammes of strychnine, 100 grammes of pure iodine, and 100 grammes of chloroform.

By Mr. Justice AVORY—Is that all?—Yes; there were about five or six different chemicals.

Was there any perchloride of mercury?—No.

Examination continued—Who served you with these chemicals?—I gave the list to the gentleman who was there. I do not know his name.

Mr. Bland?—Yes; and it was the employees who served me.

What was said when you handed that list in?—I gave the list, and I was asked to call back two or three hours later.

By Mr. Justice AVORY—Is that all that was said?—Yes.

Did Mr. Bland say anything to you when you handed the list

containing the 25 grammes of strychnine?—He asked me about the whole list, what it was for, but not specially about the strychnine.

Examination continued—You say he did not ask you anything particularly about strychnine. What did he say at all to you about the list?—To what purpose it was to be put.

What did you say?—It was for experiments on wireless.

Did you take all these things away?—Not immediately; I was asked to call back two or three hours later.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Did you take any of them away?—No.

Examination continued—I understand you went away for a couple of hours without taking anything away. Did you then return at the end of the two hours?—Yes.

Was anything given you then?—Everything; the whole packet was given to me then, but I was asked again to wait a little.

And did you wait?—I walked about the shop.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Just make this clear. Were the whole of the articles which had been specified on the list handed to you that evening?—Everything was given to me except the nitrate of silver, because I had not brought enough money.

Examination continued—Who handed these articles to you?—An employee who speaks a little French.

Was that the man who was here yesterday, Mr. Bland?—No.

What did you pay for these things?—I do not remember very well. I had a pound on me, and the amount due was more than that.

How were these things done up?—The nitrate of silver was in a small glass jar with a lid to screw on. All the chemicals were in glass jars or bottles, except the sulphate of copper.

I want you to tell me chiefly about the strychnine. How was this done up?—In a small glass jar, the same as the nitrate of silver.

Did you have any little paper packet of any kind given you?—It was all 100 grammes; it was all in small glass jars.

No paper packet?—No; the smallest quantity was the 25 grammes of strychnine.

As far as you know, was there any perchloride of mercury given you?—It was not on the list. I did not need it.

What happened to this list?—I gave it to Mr. Bland, and he did not return it to me.

Why did you buy this strychnine?—For a person.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Explain what that means?—I was asked to bring 25 grammes of strychnine, and I brought them.

To whom?—For the solicitor of the Madam Jones.

Mr. Lucy—What for?

Mr. Justice Avory—Now we have come to the point when this person must be identified.

The Attorney-General—Might we know the name of the gentleman?

Evidence for Defence.

Mr. Justice Avory—I am insisting on it now.

Examination continued—Do you know the name of this solicitor?—No.

By Mr. Justice Avory—What was he called when he was at the hotel on a Sunday?—I never heard his name mentioned.

Neither his first name nor second?—I never heard his name said; I did not pay any attention.

Examination continued—When did this person ask you to get it?—The second time that I saw him at the Blue Anchor.

How long before 1st March?—About a fortnight. I cannot be precise.

Where was this person when he asked you to buy the poison?—I was coming down from my room on the first floor at the Blue Anchor.

Whereabouts?—From the first floor to the mezzarine floor there are about five or six steps, and there is a room there known as the "dancing."

The lounge. Where did you meet this person?—In the doorway of that room known as the "dancing."

What did he say to you?—Mrs. Jones had just left this solicitor, and was going downstairs crying.

What did this person say?—He stopped me on the staircase, and we went in and he closed the door.

By Mr. Justice Avory—You mean he invited you into the lounge?—Yes.

Examination continued—What language did this person speak to you in?—Half-French, half-English.

Did he make you understand what he said?—Yes, very well.

What did he say?—He first spoke about Mrs. Jones's affairs.

In what way?—About her bankruptcy.

And then?—He then said, "You ought to do me a service—do me a favour."

What next did he say?—He said he had a dog that he wished to destroy, a dog which was ill, had the mange. I told him it was not difficult, because in France the authorities destroyed dogs taken with hydrophobia with strychnine.

What did he say to that?—"It was just that that I wished to ask."

What did you say then?—I told him I would get him some—no, he first asked, "Can you get me some?"

What did you say to that?—I said, "I will get you as much as you like."

What did he say to that?—"Very well." He took £1 and gave it to me.

Did you take the £1?—Yes; a new bank note.

Was there any more conversation at that time?—No; we left it there. I went downstairs, and he came down after me.

Jean Pierre Vaquier.

Mr. Justice AVORY—Before you leave this—I do not wish to anticipate the cross-examination—I think at the earliest stage we must have the best description this witness can give of this person.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL—My lord, I am in a position to bring into Court a gentleman who at this time acted as solicitor for Mrs. Jones. If the defence desire it I will certainly have him brought into Court.

Mr. Justice AVORY—I would rather have the description given by the witness first. (*To Witness*)—Will you describe to the best of your ability this person whom you call the solicitor?—Yes; about thirty years old and a little taller than I am.

What height are you?—1 metre 60 centimetres (about 5 feet).

Fair or dark?—Dark.

Any hair on his face?—Clean shaven—a small moustache—not clean shaven.

Can you describe his eyes at all?—Brown, and very characteristic.

What do you mean by "very characteristic"?—I say slightly Oriental.

Mr. Justice AVORY—Mr. Attorney, if this person is present in Court do you desire that the witness should see him?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL—I have no desire one way or the other, but if the defence desire to have him here I may in a certain eventuality later have to introduce him. It is exactly as Sir Henry likes.

Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—My lord, it is entirely for my friend to say whether he likes to bring in the gentleman at this moment or not.

Mr. Justice AVORY—Strictly, it should be part of the cross-examination.

Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—Yes. At any time that your lordship or my friend thinks right I should not object, naturally.

Mr. Justice AVORY—If the person who was in fact acting as solicitor for Mrs. Jones is here, I think it would be very convenient that he should be produced for the witness to see.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL—We have not brought him here, but I am told he is in Court.

Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—I think it is right to say that when I was instructed by the accused that he was going to tell this story in the witness-box, and desired to do so, I gave notice to the Director of Public Prosecutions that I thought, in view of what had already been said in his statements, that Mr. Bruce Millar should be present during this trial.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL—I think it is also right to say that, to the best of my knowledge and belief to this moment, Mr. Bruce Millar has no idea what statements are being made against him.

Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—I dare say not. I thought it

right upon my own responsibility to see that the Director of Public Prosecutions was informed.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL—My lord, this is an important matter, and I do not want there to be any misunderstanding at all between any one in this Court. The letter which was sent on 30th June to the Director of Public Prosecutions was this: "I am instructed by counsel whom I have briefed to appear for the defence of Vaquier at his trial on a charge of murder at the Surrey Assizes to give you notice, in view of the defence of the prisoner already raised in his statements, that Mr. Bruce Millar should be present throughout the trial." We replied that if they wished him to attend they should assure his attendance themselves.

Mr. Justice AVORY—Very well. Now, let him come forward. Let him be called.

[Mr. Bruce Millar was called.]

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL—My lord, there is no answer. I will take steps to ensure that there is no doubt about this gentleman being here the first thing to-morrow morning.

Mr. Justice AVORY—Very well. Now let us proceed.

Examination continued—Going back for a moment, I want to ask you regarding the entry in the poisons book. Will you just look at that? [Shown exhibit No. 8]—You see the signature "J. Wanker." You wrote that?—Yes.

When you left the chemist's shop on 1st March with your package what did you do with it?—I returned to the Blue Anchor the same evening. As soon as I arrived in the drawing-room I took out the chloroform and the strychnine; I carried it into my room, and I left the remainder next to the wireless apparatus.

The next day was Sunday. What did you do with the strychnine?—I gave it to that gentleman—I gave it to his hand.

Where did you give it?—When I saw that gentleman arrive with others they went into the saloon smoking; I went to my room to take the bottle of strychnine there, and as I came down to meet him in the saloon I met him in the passage which joins the entrance to the saloon.

What did you do?—Pausing there, I gave him the bottle wrapped in paper, the piece of paper which Mr. Bland had used to make the package.

Did you ever open that bottle?—Never. I know that it was a bottle of which the stopper was screwed on, as was the stopper of the nitrate of silver.

From the time you handed that bottle over, have you ever seen it again?—No.

I am now coming to the bromo salts. Had you ever seen a bottle of bromo salts at the Blue Anchor?—Yes; I took some myself.

A bottle like one of those blue bottles?—Yes.

You say you have taken some yourself?—Two days before the death of Mr. Jones.

Jean Pierre Vaquier.

Mr. Jones was in the habit of taking them?—When he had been drinking the day before, it was about every day.

Was anybody else besides you and Mr. Jones in the habit of taking any of these bromo salts?—Nobody else.

Now, I want to take you to the 28th of March. On that evening did you dine with Mr. and Mrs. Jones?—The evening before, yes.

What time was this?—About ten o'clock every evening.

On this evening?—About ten o'clock, 10.30.

On the 28th about what time did you have dinner?—About ten or half-past.

Were there any other people in the hotel that night?

Mr. Justice Avory—We have had plenty of evidence of this already.

Examination continued—You saw a man named Ross and those who were called yesterday?—Yes.

What time did you go to bed?—Ten o'clock exactly.

Mr. Justice Avory—He was having dinner at ten o'clock. Ask him what he means. He was having dinner at 10.30; how did he go to bed at ten o'clock?

The Witness—I said at 10.30. I went to bed immediately after dinner.

Examination continued—Did you come down at all after you had gone upstairs?—Half an hour later.

What for?—To look for matches.

Did you ask any one for a match?—I was in bed when I noticed I had no matches, and I went down again.

Whom did you ask for a match when you got downstairs?—As I went into the bar parlour I saw Mr. Jones was going into the coffee-room with a tray.

Did you get a match given you?—I asked him for a match.

Did you notice then where the blue bottle was?—On the table.

Was anything else on the table?—From thirty to forty glasses, beer glasses, whisky glasses.

I want to take you now to Saturday, the 29th. What time did you get up that day?—The same as every day.

Would that be six o'clock?—Six o'clock.

Did you do exactly the same that day as any other day?—Yes.

Did you touch the bottle of bromo salts at all that day?—No; I paid no attention to it.

Did you touch them?—No.

Or the night before?—No.

Were you present when Mr. Jones took these salts on that morning?—Yes; I was sitting down.

Did you notice whether Mr. Jones did anything? Did you notice first of all how much of these salts Mr. Jones took?

By Mr. Justice Avory—Was he sitting in the bar parlour?—Yes.

Mr. A. B. Lucy.

Evidence for Defence.

Jean Pierre Vaquier

Examination continued—Did you notice how much of these salts Mr. Jones took?—A bottle was bought about eight or nine days before. He took about a spoonful every morning. I had taken one which he offered me, and two more which makes three, so that there were about three or four doses in the bottle.

Did you notice how much of these salts Mr. Jones took that morning?—The same as every day, a teaspoonful.

Did you notice Mr. Jones drink the salts?—No; not that day.

On the 29th?—No.

Actually drinking them?—No; I was reading my paper.

You saw nothing of the drinking of the salts?—No.

Did you notice what Mr. Jones did at all? You say you never saw him take them at all, but did you notice Mr. Jones do anything?—What called my attention was that as he drank the salts he spat.

Spat what?—He spat out some water.

Where?—On the ground as soon as he had drunk them, and he went and opened the door and spat outside.

Is that the door which leads into the back-yard?—Yes.

Did you also notice Mrs. Jones taste some of the contents of the bottle afterwards?—When Mr. Jones came back they looked at the glass. Mr. Jones went away.

Did you notice Mrs. Jones taste the salts?—Yes.

What did she do exactly?—She took the bottle which Mr. Jones had placed on the table; she poured about the contents of half a teaspoonful on to her hand, she wetted her finger, and brought it to her tongue, tasting it, and spat out, and they spoke together, but I did not understand what they said.

What about the salts which remained on her hand?—When she noticed their bitterness she said they were bitter, and she threw the remainder in her hand into the fire. The contents of the bottle which she had in her hand she also threw into the fire. I caught her arm and told her to keep it for the doctor, but she went away with the bottle.

The Attorney-General—I do not follow that.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—I am told by Major Watkins that there was some little mistake of the interpretation of that too; we might have it again.

Examination continued—Regarding what was remaining on her hand when she noticed the bitterness, what did she do?—She spat.

And after that?—She threw what she had in her hand into the fire, and as she did so she had the bottle in her right hand.

The Attorney-General—He has not told us what she did with the bottle in her right hand.

The Witness—She threw the contents of it into the fire. I caught her arm, and I said, "Keep that for the doctor." And she carried the bottle away with her and the glass.

Jean Pierre Vaquier.

Examination continued—The next thing you did was to go to the lavatory and help Mr. Jones upstairs?—Yes.

And then we know the doctor arrived. You stayed outside the bedroom door?—When the doctor arrived I met him at the entrance to the doorway.

Then did you go upstairs?—I helped Mr. Jones upstairs with Mr. Whitewick. We put Mr. Jones on the bed, and as Mr. Jones did not wish us to touch him I went to the doorway of the bedroom and I remained there.

I want to ask you about the incident of this bottle in the kitchen drawer. You went some time after the doctor was there into the kitchen, did you?—I went downstairs after the doctor had given the first injection. I went downstairs to tell George in the bar that Mr. Jones was speaking, and that it did not seem serious.

Then what happened after you had spoken to George?—I went to the kitchen.

Did you there see Mrs. Fisher?—As I wished to know what the salt was for the doctor, I went to the kitchen.

What did you do there?—I saw Mrs. Fisher in the centre of the kitchen.

What next?—The doctor was upstairs. I said, "You must give the bottle to the doctor," but as she did not understand she conducted me in front of the drawer; she opened the drawer. She said, "The bottle for the doctor—here it is." She put it into my hand. I replied, "When the doctor asks for it, give it to him—to him alone."

By Mr. Justice Avory—What did you do with it?—I put it back into the drawer before her—in her presence. She closed the drawer and I went away.

Examination continued—You heard Mrs. Whitewick say that after the death of Mr. Jones there was a conversation in which Mrs. Jones accused you of killing her husband——

Mr. Justice Avory—Put your question. You are merely making a statement.

Examination continued—Do you remember, after Mr. Jones had died, did you ask Mrs. Jones whether her husband was asleep ——

By Mr. Justice Avory—Did you say anything about his being *couche?*—I could not speak to Mrs. Jones whether her husband was *couche*, since I had seen him die. I did not speak to Mrs. Jones.

Examination continued—On the evening of that same day do you remember Mrs. Jones throwing your photograph into the fire?—Yes.

What did you say when she threw it into the fire?—It touched me very much; I was moved very much by that gesture, and that made me suppose that Mrs. Jones suspected me of the death of Mr. Jones.

What did you say, if anything?—I cried.

Evidence for Defence.

Jean Pierre Vaquier

The next day did Mrs. Jones ask you to go?—Yes.

What did she say to you?—It was two o'clock in the coffee-room; she came towards me near the fireplace where I was sitting, and she said to me in French, "Monsieur Vaquier, baggage."

Did anybody else also tell you to go?—The same evening, the solicitor of Mrs. Jones.

You mean the Sunday, or which day?—The same day, Sunday.

What did he say?—I was in the coffee-room; as I did not go out of it he said to me also, "Monsieur Vaquier, you must go."

By Mr. Justice Avory—Was that the same day that Mrs. Jones told you to go?—Two hours later; and I told her I would not go without my money.

Told her or him?—To her and to him.

Examination continued—During the next few days were you ill?—I was indisposed; I was suffering at the time.

What were you suffering from?—I did not eat, and I was very weak.

What did you go to London for on 3rd April?—First, I had had the visit of a doctor from Byfleet. The doctor made out an order, and I went to the French Hospital in London to be admitted.

You were not admitted?—The doctor had gone, had left the hospital, and I was asked to come back the next day.

By Mr. Justice Avory—What did you want to be admitted to the hospital for?—Because life at the Blue Anchor was impossible for me.

Examination continued—You made various statements from time to time?—Yes.

And are they correct, what you stated?—Not the first that I made.

What is wrong in the first one?—There were different things which were badly interpreted.

But you have had the right interpretation given now, have you not?—Yes.

Are the other statements correct?—Yes.

Is exhibit No. 7, the statement that you made on arrest, true also?—Yes.

[Shown exhibit No. 20]—You wrote that?—Yes.

When did you write that?—After the death of Mr. Jones.

[Shown exhibit No. 21]—Did you write that?—I wrote that the day I was going to London.

Did you have anything to do with the death of Mr. Jones?—I had no reason to desire the death of Mr. Jones, less than his wife.

You had nothing to do with the death of Mr. Jones?—No.

Cross-examined by the Attorney-General—When you were in Biarritz had you become very much attached to Mrs. Jones?—Not more than that.

Do I understand that you had no affection for her at all?—I had friendship for her simply—pity.

Jean Pierre Vaquier.

Did you have nothing more than pity for her when you took her to the Hotel Bayonne?—Friendship simply.

Had you intended to go to Paris before you knew that Mrs. Jones was going?—Yes, certainly.

Had you intended to go to England before you knew that Mrs. Jones was going?—Yes.

Had you any idea what hotel you were going to in London before you had asked Mrs. Jones?—No.

When was the last time that you had been to England before this occasion?—Never.

Had you intended to go to England on the actual day that you did go, without knowing that Mrs. Jones was going? Before you knew that Mrs. Jones was going to England had you determined to go on that very day?—No.

Did not you go to England because Mrs. Jones was going there?—No, not at all.

When you landed in England, did you know Mrs. Jones's home address—The Blue Anchor, Byfleet?—Yes.

How did you know that?—She gave it to me in writing.

Did you ask her for it?—We were on friendly terms; it was quite natural she should give me her address.

When you landed in England you had 20,000 or 23,000 francs with you?—Yes.

Where did you keep it?—In a pocket-book, the pocket-book that was taken from me by the police.

Is it true that you borrowed £14 to pay your hotel bill?—I did not borrow it; it was Mrs. Jones who offered me the cheque.

What did she give you the cheque for?—The evening that we were dining at the Russell Hotel we were having coffee and she gave me the cheque for £14, which her husband had given her before she went to France, and as she had said to her husband that she had spent it, she gave it to me to pay the bill of the hotel. She signed it there and then with my fountain pen.

To pay whose bill?—My bill.

Why should Mrs. Jones pay your hotel bill?—Because she had told her husband that she had spent this cheque in France; she did not want to give him the money, and she told me to pay the bill with that cheque.

At that time had you got 20,000 francs in your pocket?—Yes.

In French money?—French money—pardon, I had changed it at the time, and I offered to pay the hotel either in money or by cheque.

Had you got a banking account?—I did not need it.

When you say by cheque do you mean by Mrs. Jones's cheque?—Yes.

Did you ever give her back the change from the cheque?—No; I took certain medicines to her for herself.

Where did you change the 20,000 francs?—In two different establishments.

What size of notes did you get?—£5 notes.

When you went to Byfleet did you go there to see Mrs. Jones?—I went there to see Mr. Jones, as I had invited him to come and see me at the Hotel Russell.

Why did you stay at the Blue Anchor? Was it because you were still attached to Mrs. Jones?—Not at all; because it was less expensive than London and because I was less alone.

Do I understand you to say that you were not fond of Mrs. Jones at all when you were at the Blue Anchor Hotel?—I had still the same friendship for her as in France.

Were you anxious to sleep with her again?—Not at all.

When did that feeling cease?—From the time I arrived in England till the time I arrived at the Blue Anchor.

Mr. Justice Avory—That is no answer.

Cross-examination continued—What was the last time in fact that you slept with Mrs. Jones?—At the Russell Hotel.

By Mr. Justice Avory—What date?—I cannot give it precisely.

Cross-examination continued—How old are you?—Forty-five years.

Do you know what strychnine is?—I knew that it was a deadly poison—a violent poison.

Did you know that it was very dangerous?—I knew that the authorities in France killed dogs with strychnine.

Have you ever bought strychnine in France before?—Never.

Has any one ever asked you before to buy dangerous poisons for them?—Nobody.

When did you first meet the solicitor who asked you to buy the strychnine?—Three or four days after my arrival at Byfleet.

Did you speak to him?—No.

When was the next time that you saw him?—The Sunday after.

Was that the time that he asked you to buy the strychnine?—Yes.

And the person who asked you to buy the strychnine was somebody to whom you had never spoken before?—No.

You mean by that that my question was accurate?—I had never spoken to him; he had not been introduced to me.

Did it strike you as peculiar that a person you had never spoken to in your life should ask you to buy a deadly poison?—No; because after that gentleman had gone, Mr. Jones, speaking of him, had said, "Monsieur Solicitor of Madam Jones."

You do not speak English, do you?—At that time, no.

Did he tell you where you could find a chemist who could speak French?—No.

Did you tell him that you knew a chemist who could speak French?—No; I told him I would bring him some.

Does this solicitor carry on his practice in London?—Yes.

Jean Pierre Vaquier.

Did you know of any reason why he could not buy the poison for himself?—He told me that he was very busy and had not time to buy it.

Would you like to answer that question once more. Just think again.

Mr. Justice Avory—Put it another way. "Will you swear he said that to you?"

Cross-examination continued—Will you swear that he said to you that he had not time to go to the chemist?—Yes.

He wanted strychnine to kill a dog?—For a dog.

Only one dog?—One dog.

A dog with the mange?—Yes—ill.

Was this gentleman a sufficient French scholar to be able to say the word "mange" in French?—Yes.

He gave you a sovereign?—A pound note.

Did that strike you as a large sum of money to buy enough strychnine for one dog?—He perhaps had no change.

Did you ever give him the change that you must have got from buying the strychnine?—No; he never asked me; I gave him his bottle.

How much was the strychnine that you bought?—I did not know; I paid the bill all together.

Then if this gentleman had asked you for the change you would not have known how much it was?—No.

You went up to the chemist. Did you know you were asking for 25 grammes of strychnine?—Yes.

You know what 25 grammes of a substance like strychnine looks like?—I asked for 25 grammes as I might have asked for 100 grammes.

Did it appear to you that that was about the quantity that you got—25 grammes?—Yes.

That is about 385 grains. When you signed your name at the chemist's shop in the book did you know what you were signing?—I did not see the word "strychnine" or anything written in the book that I signed.

Does that mean that there was nothing written, or that you did not look to see?—I was asked to sign, as everyone else, under the names of the other people, and I signed it.

Did you know what the book was that you were signing?—No.

Had you ever signed a book when you had been to that chemist before?—No.

Did it strike you, therefore, as unusual that you should sign a book this time?—I knew that one signs a book when it is a question of poisons.

By Mr. Justice Avory—You knew that before?—I know that chemists are forced to have a poisons book to be signed.

The question is: did you know that before you went to this shop?—No.

Evidence for Defence.

Jean Pierre Vaquier

Cross-examination continued—When you signed that book did you think it was something unusual?—I was told, "Among the chemicals there is poison, and you must sign."

By Mr. Justice AVORY—Mr. Bland told you that?—Yes.

Cross-examination continued—Do you see the part that you wrote yourself [shown exhibit]?—Yes.

Is that your usual signature?—No.

What have you written there?—A name of some kind.

What is the name you have written there?—"Wanker."

You knew then that you were putting a false name to the poisons book?—Because I had been told that.

You knew that the bit of paper you were signing was a poisons book?—I was told to sign a book. As there was poison amongst the quantity of stuff I was buying, I was told to sign a book.

Did you realise that that meant that the person who bought the poison had to leave his name?—I did not understand that.

What did you think you were writing your name for?—I did not write my name.

What did you think you had been asked to write your name for?—I attached no importance to it.

If that is so, why did not you put your real name?—Because I had been told that when you buy poison you never sign your own name.

Who told you that?—The solicitor.

Did the gentleman who asked you to buy the poison tell you to sign a false name?—Yes.

Did it strike you as odd that a complete stranger, who wanted to poison a dog, was telling you to sign a false name?—No.

Do I understand you to say that you signed a false name merely because a complete stranger asked you to?—Yes; if he had told me to sign my name I should have signed it.

Did you tell the chemist how to spell your name?—No.

Do you know how the chemist got to spell your name "Wanker"?—He might have read "Vaquier," or he might have read "Wanker."

Did you buy any form of corrosive poison at all?—Other than that, never.

Other than what: do you call strychnine a corrosive poison?—Every poison is a corrosive, I believe.

What did you want 100 grammes of chloroform for?—For my personal use.

Had you seen Mr. Jones drunk in this hotel at times?—I carried him three times to bed.

Had it ever entered your mind that if anybody wanted to kill Mr. Jones that would be the most easy time to do it?—No.

At the time when you carried Mr. Jones up to bed would it have been easy to give him chloroform?—It was easy to give him anything you liked.

Jean Pierre Vaquier.

He was so insensible he could have been easily suffocated with chloroform?—Very easy. A child could have killed him.

What did you do with that chloroform?—I inhaled it to sleep.

Did you ever tell the chemist you wanted some chloroform to inhale?—Yes.

Then did you tell the chemist what you wanted all the various things for that you bought?—Yes.

Why did you not tell the chemist you wanted the strychnine to poison a dog?—I had not to give him the detail of all my buyings, all my things bought.

Did you think there was no more importance in buying a deadly poison like strychnine than anything else?—I have bought chemicals in France. Cyanide of potassium is a poison also, a corrosive, a violent poison.

Did you write the name "Wanker" in order that the chemist should not know what your real name was?—No.

I thought you had been told to write a false name?—The solicitor of Mr. Jones had told me not to write my name, to write a false name.

Did you understand that to mean so that the person who received your written name should not know who you were?—No.

What did you think was the reason for writing a false name?—He knew me.

What name had you given to the chemist before?—No name before.

Then when you say he knew you, he knew you by sight and not by name?—By sight.

Did you ever occupy room 60 at the Hotel Russell?—I do not remember the number.

Did you purposely give a false number to the chemist?—I give any number sometimes; I do not remember the number of my room.

Did you intend to give him the real address?—Yes.

Then why did not you give him the address, Blue Anchor Hotel at Byfleet, where you were living?—Every time I went to London I went to get my letters at the Hotel Russell, and I made a list of the chemicals out on paper having the heading of the Russell Hotel.

By Mr. Justice Avory—What was the number of the room that you occupied at the Hotel Russell from the 9th to the 16th February?—I do not know exactly; I cannot be precise about it.

How did you find your way to the room if you did not know the number?—I knew the floor; the liftman took me up to the floor without asking me, and I found my room without taking any notice of the number.

Cross-examination continued—The number appears on the exhibit?—I might have noticed it; I had the number on the key.

Who told you how much strychnine to buy?—Nobody.

You decided that for yourself?—I put 25 grammes as I might have put 100 grammes.

Did not you ask the chemist how much 25 grammes of strychnine would cost?—No.

Did not you care?—I paid the bill and asked for everything together.

By Mr. Justice Avory—I should like to know, did you ask the chemist how much strychnine was necessary to kill a dog?—No.

Cross-examination continued—Have you ever killed a dog with strychnine yourself?—No; I have seen them die, but I have never killed any.

I want to ask a question or two about the hotel on the morning of the death. Were you sitting in the bar parlour about half-past eight in the morning?—No.

Do you know that Mrs. Fisher has said that you were sitting in the armchair in the bar parlour about half-past eight in the morning?—I know that she said so, but I was not there.

Did she ask you to move because she was dusting?—No.

Did you hear or know that Mrs. Whitewick says you were there between ten minutes and a quarter-past nine on the same morning?—I know that.

Were you there at all about a quarter-past nine?—No.

Were you moving the bottles on the mantelpiece that morning?—No bottle at all.

When did you first go into the bar parlour that morning?—When I came down I went and made my coffee, and then entered in the bar parlour.

What time was that?—Coming down from my room I took my coffee and went for a walk; I came into the bar parlour, where I saw George, whom I asked whether Mr. Jones had been ill the evening before.

Can you tell me what time was it that you went into the bar parlour?—About eight o'clock.

How long did you stop there?—Very little time. Mrs. Fisher made my breakfast, and I went and took it in the coffee-room.

Were you in the bar parlour practically all the time between 8.40 and the time when Mr. Jones took the poison?—No.

Mr. Justice Avory—He has already said he was not there either at 8.30 or 9.15.

The Witness—I did not go into the bar parlour until after I had had my breakfast in the coffee-room.

Cross-examination continued—When was that?—About half-past nine.

Did you hear one witness say that that morning and the morning before you had used the bar parlour for the first time early in the morning?—I went there every morning.

By Mr. Justice Avory—What time?—As soon as I had had my coffee.

Jean Pierre Vaquier.

Jean Pierre Vaquier

Cross-examination continued—What time was that?—Half-past six to seven.

For how long?—I went to fetch the dog, and went out for a walk.

When did you go back to the bar parlour again?—After my walk, about nine o'clock—half-past eight to nine.

On the morning Mr. Jones died did you know the bromo salts bottle was nearly empty?—I knew that it was empty. Mrs. Jones threw the contents in the fire.

Did you know that there was very little left in the bottle?—No.

Had you no idea how much there was in the bottle?—I had not noticed it.

I thought you had told us already that you had taken three doses out of it, and that practically all the rest had gone except three or four doses?—I have calculated since that Mr. Jones, having taken a dose a day, and myself three, there should be left three to four doses, but I did not see them.

When did you have a dose out of the bottle—how long before Mr. Jones's death?—Two evenings before.

How much was there in the bottle then?—Five or six doses; I did not notice it, I did not remark upon it.

Do I understand you did not see Mr. Jones drink the poison?—No.

What was the first thing that you heard or saw?—I heard when he spat.

When was the first time that it entered your head that he had been poisoned?—When the doctor gave him injections; I saw him die and tremble.

Until the doctor came had you not the least idea that he had taken poison?—No.

Then why did you tell Mrs. Jones to keep the bottle for the doctor?—I heard him vomit on the other side.

But you had not seen him drink anything, had you?—I saw when he had had the salts he took every day he went and spat outside, and he went and vomited elsewhere—I could then understand that he had taken something.

How did you know that he had taken bromo salts if you did not see him do it?—The bottle was on the table and the glass.

Did you therefore jump to the conclusion that there was something in the bottle?—When they were looking at the glass, Mr. and Mrs. Jones, I understood there was something within the bottle.

When the doctor was upstairs did you go downstairs and ask Mrs. Fisher where the bottle was?—No.

When did you go and ask for the bottle?—After the doctor had given his first injection.

Then you did go down after the doctor was there?—I came

down after the doctor had given the first injection and Mr. Jones had become conscious again.

What had the bottle got to do with you: why were you concerned about the bottle?—Because I wished to know what was the matter.

Why did you want to take the bottle to do that?—I did not wish to take it; I simply told Mrs. Fisher to give that bottle to no one but the doctor.

Did you ever have that bottle in your hand?—That day?

I thought you said Mrs. Fisher put it into your hand?—But I put it back into the drawer before her; it remained one second in my hand.

Did you hear Mrs. Fisher say she was cleaning the scullery steps and you went into the room behind her back?—I did not understand.

Did you not understand that Mrs. Fisher said she did not know——

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—My recollection was that Mrs. Fisher said she did not see him go out because her back was turned. I do not think she said she did not see him come in.

Mr. Justice Avory—On the contrary, she said she saw him go to the drawer.

Cross-examination continued—Do you not know that Mrs. Fisher said she saw you go to the drawer, and did not know whether you took the bottle out or not?—I saw in the paper by the translation what she said.

Is what she said true?—Not at all.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Put the actual words which she said were used—"Medicine! Doctor! Quick!" Is that true?—Not at all.

Did you point to the bottle, the other bottle of kruschen on the dresser, so as to show what you wanted?—No.

It is all untrue?—All untrue.

Cross-examination continued—Do you desire to put suspicion upon somebody else in this case?—After what I wrote to the police that is to be understood.

What do you mean by this, "I will make known to-morrow he who administered the poison." Who was the person you had in mind?—The person at the Blue Anchor.

Who is the person you intended at that time to name to the police the next day?—I wished to indicate the solicitor of Mrs. Jones, who had asked me to buy the poison.

Is there anybody else whom you intended to name except the solicitor of Mrs. Jones?—I said that the solicitor of Mrs. Jones could not have put the poison in the bottle since he had not been there for eight days.

Did you intend to put suspicion on somebody else for having put the poison in the glass?—No.

That you swear?—Yes.

What did you mean by your statement (exhibit No. 30) in which you say this, "I think the second act of the drama will be the disappearance of the wife of George." Who is George?—The manager.

Whitewick?—Yes.

What did you mean by telling the police that you thought the next thing would be the disappearance of the wife of George?—Because George has not perhaps a clear conscience with regard to Mrs. Jones, because he might know something.

Did you not mean by that that the next person to be murdered would be the wife of George?—Mr. Jones told me this, that George would never leave the Blue Anchor even if he earned £5 a day in France, therefore there must be an interest of some kind for him to remain there. Why should he remain there?

Did you not mean by that sentence—I will read it to you again, "The second act of the drama will be the disappearance of the wife of George as mysteriously and also as tragically as Mr. Jones"—did you not mean by that suggestion that the next person to be murdered would be George's wife?—Yes; since she wished to go away to France.

And did you mean by this statement to suggest that the murderer would be George?—I cannot indicate any one.

Did you not throughout this statement indicate George as being the person who was responsible for all that Mrs. Jones did?—Yes.

Did you not mean to convey to the police that the suspicion ought to fall upon George?—I wished simply to instruct, to give them certain knowledge, to give the police certain knowledge, to enlighten the police.

After having made that statement, do you ask us to believe that you wanted to help the police in every way in your power?—I showed them the way to follow.

By indicating George?—Indicating every one at the Blue Anchor.

Was the only person whom you did not indicate the solicitor of Mrs. Jones?—I indicated him several times.

You knew that Mr. Jones had been murdered?—I knew that he had taken strychnine; everybody knew it.

Did you know that he had died by strychnine?—I knew that he had died poisoned.

And by strychnine?—No.

When did you first hear that he had died as a result of strychnine?—When Superintendent Boshier accused me.

You knew that the solicitor of Mrs. Jones had made you buy strychnine?—Yes.

Have you ever until to-day told the police that this solicitor ordered or asked you to buy strychnine?—No.

If you were anxious to put suspicion upon every one in the house, and that was true, why did you not tell them that?—I wished to tell the police all I could, but I could not tell them I had been told to buy strychnine. I could not say it was the strychnine I had bought for this gentleman that had killed Mr. Jones.

Did you in your last statement to the police (exhibit No. 7) say, "He who had the poison bought, since the first day all suspicions is against me, and if I said nothing it was that I had the firm conviction that the police would have discovered the culprit, but, as I am now accused, to-morrow without fail I will tell the truth." That is what you said to the police. Did you mean then to accuse George or the solicitor?—The solicitor.

And from that day to this have you ever mentioned to the police, or any one representing the police, that the solicitor had told you to buy poison?—Not the police, but to reporters.

What reporters have you seen since you have been in the custody of the police?—I said that before I was arrested.

I am asking you if you ever at any time said to the police that you had been told or asked to buy the poison by the solicitor?—No.

Re-examined by Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—Did you know what the fatal dose of strychnine was in amount?—No.

[Shown exhibit No. 4]—You see this paragraph, "I say that if the poison which killed Mr. Jones was not put in his glass by the criminal himself (involuntary criminal, perhaps) it was put there by a servant in the pay of this cowardly suitor with the object according to me, a foreigner, to have me accused of this horrible tragedy." Who did you mean by "this cowardly suitor"?—The solicitor of Mrs. Jones.

Then further on in this statement, "It is among these suitors that it is possible to find the cowardly assassin who makes the suspicion of having committed the most terrible and the most cowardly murder ever perpetrated hover over an honest man." Who did you mean when you wrote that: who had you in your mind when you wrote that?—The solicitor of Madame Jones.

Mr. Justice Avory—Then we may take it that throughout exhibit No. 29 he meant to refer to the solicitor.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—If your lordship pleases.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Is that so? Throughout that statement in exhibit No. 29 did you intend to refer to the solicitor?—Yes.

Re-examination continued—There is another reference I want to refer to, I want to put a question to you upon the statement made on arrest, "He who had the poison bought." Who did you mean by that?—The solicitor of Mrs. Jones.

By Mr. Justice Avory—I want to ask two questions. [Shown exhibit No. 5]—You see the passage in the third paragraph

beginning "I unfortunately do not understand English." Look at the end of that, "I will always say everywhere, before my judges, if I am to go before them, that the assassin, this cowardly criminal, is still at the Blue Anchor." Who did you mean by that?—He who put the poison in the glass of Mr. Jones must live at the Blue Anchor.

"Is still at the Blue Anchor." To whom were you referring; who had you in your mind?—Nobody; I simply said the assassin must be at the Blue Anchor; he must have put the poison in the bottle.

In the first statement which you made at Woking Police Station did you say it was known at the hotel at Biarritz that Mrs. Jones was a married woman?—Yes.

Did you go on to say, "My relations with her were only that of a friend"?—Yes.

Did you say, "We certainly did not cohabit"?—At the Blue Anchor?

No, not at the Blue Anchor. This is the statement at the police station; when you spoke of her being in Biarritz you said, "I did not accompany her on her tour to Lourdes; I did not accompany her on this tour, but saw her again on her return to Biarritz"?—Yes.

Did you go on to say, "My relations with her were only that of a friend; we certainly did not cohabit"?—I said I had no passion for her, but simply friendship.

Did you say in another statement that you loved her as a sister only?—Simply.

That was untrue, was it not?—It was simply friendship such as one has for a sister.

The Court adjourned.

Fourth Day—Saturday, 5th July, 1924.

JEAN PIERRE VAQUIER (recalled), further examined by Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—It is said by Mrs. Jones that on the Wednesday or Thursday, 3rd or 4th April, she had a conversation with you when she accused you of assassinating Mr. Jones, and that you said in answer to this statement by her, "You assassinated Mr. Jones." "Yes, Mabs, for you," and that she then said, "I would have killed you if I thought you would do a thing like that." Did that conversation take place?—Never.

Did she say at any time to you that you had assassinated her husband?—I never understood that.

Did you ever say in answer to her, "Yes, Mabs, for you," in English?—I do not understand English, and I could not have said that since I had not assassinated Mr. Jones. I had never killed a man for Mrs. Jones.

The other matter I wanted to ask you about is exhibit No. 19. [Shown exhibit]—I want to refer to "Why not wait a little while?" Just look at the entry there in English and in French, "Why not wait a little while until my business is settled"? Do you remember under what circumstances Mrs. Jones wrote that in English?—No.

Have you any recollection at all as to when that was written or to what it refers to?—No.

At the bottom or in another place in exhibit No. 19 is, "Who's master, you or I?" Do you see in English "Who's master, you or I," and underneath that translated into French? Is the English in Mrs. Jones's handwriting? It has been proved to be?—Yes.

And the French is in your handwriting?—Yes.

Can you tell us as to the circumstances under which these words were written down?—I do not remember.

Do you remember when they were written down?—No; this was written down after I had seen Mr. Schulte, as it is written on a printed form of Mr. Schulte.

I do not quite follow?—I do not remember the circumstances.

Do you mean after you had seen Mr. Schulte or after Mr. Schulte came to the Blue Anchor?—When I saw him at the Blue Anchor.

Further cross-examined by the ATTORNEY-GENERAL—What was Mrs. Jones's christian name?—Now I know it.

What is it?—Mabs.

How do you know that was her name?—Because I saw it in the papers.

Did you not know that this lady's name was Mabs until you saw it in the papers?—No.

What did her husband call her?—I cannot remember; it was in English words that I did not understand, which I did not know.

By Mr. Justice Avory—Before you leave that, what did you call her?—At Biarritz I called her Madame Jones.

After?—I always called her Madame Jones.

At the Hotel Russell?—Yes.

Further cross-examination continued—Will you take the pink paper. Have you translated that sentence yourself word for word?—With the dictionary.

Was it something Mrs. Jones wrote down in order that you might understand it?—Yes.

Mrs. Jones has stated that you were asking her to leave her husband?—Never.

And that this was the answer, "Why not wait until my business is settled"?—I never asked Mrs. Jones to leave her husband except for one time when I told her she was too unhappy and she should not live like that, but I never told her that she should come with me.

Did you suggest that she should go with any one else?—No.

Look at the other note, "Who's master, you or I"? Did Mrs. Jones write that?—That is her writing.

Did you translate that word by word and write the translation underneath?—Yes.

Has there been a discussion between you and Mrs. Jones as to which of you two was master?—We never had a discussion, and I do not remember under what circumstances this was written.

The Attorney-General—I have an application to make to your lordship that the gentleman whose name was mentioned last night should be allowed to be called as a witness, Mr. Bruce Millar.

Mr. Justice Avory—Yes, certainly, he should be called.

Gerald Ernest Bruce Millar, examined by the Attorney-General—My business address is 28a Basinghall Street, London, E.C.2, and my private address is "Upperton," Stanley Road, Sutton, Surrey. I am a solicitor by profession, and I acted as solicitor for both Mr. and Mrs. Jones. I had acted as Mr. Jones's solicitor from August, 1923, and I was still acting for him up to the time of his death.

What were your relations with Mr. Jones: were they friendly or otherwise?—Quite friendly.

For how long had you acted as solicitor for Mrs. Jones?—Since October last year.

You told us your relations with Mr. Jones were friendly. Have you in your possession correspondence from Mr. Jones as late as 19th March of this year?—Yes.

Had Mr. Jones, as far as you know, ever changed his relationship to you up to the date of his death?—No, not a bit.



[*Photo. by Barratt Photo Press, Ltd.*

Sir Patrick Hastings, K.C.

Evidence for Defence.

Gerald E. B. Millar

The suggestion has been made in this case that you were Mrs. Jones's lover. Is there any truth in that statement?—It is an absolute lie.

Were you in Court yesterday afternoon when the accused was giving evidence?—No.

It was suggested by the accused yesterday afternoon that upon one occasion you asked him to buy strychnine. Is there any truth in that?—An absolute lie.

That you gave him a sovereign to go and buy it?—Absolutely false.

Mr. Justice AVORY—You must be particular—a £1 note.

Examination continued—The accused also alleges that he gave you a glass bottle containing a substantial quantity of strychnine which he had bought for you. Is that true?—Absolutely false.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL—I think there is a question which, in fairness to this witness, ought to be put, if your lordship would allow. (*To Witness*)—Do not answer this until his lordship has decided. I propose to ask this witness whether he had any part at all in the death of Mr. Jones.

Mr. Justice AVORY—I do not see any objection to the question, although I doubt whether it is necessary. I see no objection.

Examination continued—Will you answer that?—Absolutely none at all.

Mr. Justice AVORY—I think you should ask the witness about the other conversation with regard to the chemist?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL—I am obliged to your lordship. (*To Witness*)—It is also suggested that you told the accused that in buying the strychnine he ought to give a false name. Is that true?—Absolutely untrue.

Cross-examined by Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—Only one question. If the accused says what the Attorney-General has put to you, it is either a lie or a delusion?—Quite.

Sir HENRY CURTIS BENNETT—That is my case, my lord.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL—My lord, I do not propose in this case to exercise my right of reply. I shall allow Sir Henry Curtis Bennett to speak last.

Mr. Justice AVORY—As you please.

Closing Speech for the Crown.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said that, as in this case the accused was a foreigner, he had decided to waive his right, as Law Officer of the Crown, of having the last word to the jury. The prosecution were anxious that the accused himself should feel that he had been treated in this case with every possible fairness. He thought every one had been struck by the extreme skill and fairness which

The Attorney-General

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett had put into the accused's defence, and that as a result the accused had had every possible skilled assistance that he could have had.

The Attorney-General went on to say that the case was not really very involved. If he had known when he made his opening speech what had been revealed in the evidence, he could not have said very much beyond what he said then. In one of his statements Vaquier had said that his relationship with Mrs. Jones was purely friendly. As nothing could be admitted in a criminal Court, the prosecution had to prove the guilty intercourse which had taken place between them. The jury would probably come to the conclusion that, apart from that fact and the evidence of Mrs. Jones, a large amount of the evidence of others in the case was comparatively unimportant. The unhappy man, Mr. Jones, was undoubtedly murdered, and the only question for the jury to consider was whether the accused was the man who committed the murder. There were about six points in the case to which he should direct their attention, and the first was the relation between the accused and Mrs. Jones. He (counsel) thought it was beyond all question that the accused was obsessed by a passion for this woman.

Touching upon the question of money, the Attorney-General said that one could not close one's eyes to the fact that if a man had committed a murder the first thing which probably would occur to him would be to eliminate from the mind of any one who came to consider the case every possible question of motive. In a statement which he made long before he was accused he suggested that his relationship with Mrs. Jones was merely that of a friend, and in his other statements there was the suggestion that, so far as money was concerned, he came over to this country with 20,000 francs. Vaquier had declared that the first time he met Mr. Jones he lent him £100, and that, although he had £150 in his breast-pocket, he accepted a cheque for £14 from Mrs. Jones to pay his hotel bill.

"I suggest to you that if this woman had desired to get rid of the £14 she would have had no difficulty in London. It may be that you will think that this story was unfounded, that this man had not got a penny in the world when he came to pay his hotel bill, either in London or Byfleet. It may be that you will think that if a penniless man comes over to England, following a woman for whom he has developed an attachment, his passion for her is stronger than you would otherwise imagine. The accused was obviously passionately fond of Mrs. Jones. It was obvious he was that wretched woman's lover. The vital matter for consideration was why the accused alone of every one who was connected with the hotel should buy poison on 1st March. The whole essence of his story was that the poison was ordered by some one else, and that, therefore, there could not have been any possible interest for him to have bought it. The accused had

paved the way by giving a false name before the purchase of the poison, but on 1st March the poisons book was necessary. The first lie was in the first column, the name, 'J. Wanker.' The second lie was in the next column, in which the accused gave a fictitious room at the Hotel Russell, when, in fact, he was living at Byfleet. The third lie was in the column where he gave the reason for the purchase of the poison as 'wireless experiment,' and the fourth was in the column where he signed a false signature."

Dealing with the accused's story that he was asked to buy the strychnine by Mr. Bruce Millar, the Attorney-General said that, so far as they knew, Mr. Bruce Millar was a respectable solicitor, and, so far as they knew, a man against whom nothing had been said. Could any one believe a story like that which the accused told? He suggested that the accused's story was beyond all human credulity.

Continuing, the Attorney-General said that he thought his lordship would tell the jury that they need not consider the question of the suggestions that the accused might have made which reflected upon other people. If the accused were a party to it, it did not matter if every single person in the hotel was being charged. It did not help him to throw suspicion upon all the others in the hotel.

The Attorney-General next directed the jury's attention to the remarks of the accused that when Mr. Jones drank the salts, according to the accused, he spat and said something, and that Mrs. Jones threw something into the fire. According to him (the accused) he said to her, "Do not do that; the doctor will want it." What made the accused think that the doctor would want that bottle? He could not understand what was being said.

The Attorney-General then drew attention to the statement made by Mrs. Fisher that the accused said, "Medicine! Doctor! Quick!" What did it matter to the accused where the bottle was if he were an innocent man? There was no question that somebody picked up that bottle and washed it out. The Frenchman could not speak English, so what business was it of his to come down and say to Mrs. Fisher, "The doctor wants the bottle?" At any rate, the result was that all traces of strychnine were removed from this bottle. Could the jury have the slightest doubt that the accused came down, took the bottle, and washed it in the hope that no traces of strychnine would be found?

The Attorney-General then referred to the accused's statement with regard to George being the person who carried on everything relating to Mrs. Jones, and asked: "Do you not think that that was intended to convey the impression to the police that the murderer was George? You know the statement about the murderer being still in the hotel. Was that not intended also to refer to George"? In conclusion, he asked the jury to say that there was only one possible verdict, and that was that the accused was guilty.

Jean Pierre Vaquier.

Sir Henry C. Bennett

Closing Speech for the Defence.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett, after a tribute to the way the prosecution had conducted their case, laid stress upon the fact that the accused man did not understand the English law and was unacquainted with the procedure that the prosecution should prove their case. The jury had to determine whether or not the story Vaquier told in the witness-box was a true story. If they believed that story, then there was an end to the case against Vaquier. If they came to the conclusion that it was not a story upon which they could rely, then they would have to consider why such a story should have been told. The Crown's suggestion that the story was untrue, and that the reason the story was untrue was that the accused was, in fact, guilty of the murder, was not all that could be said. He would ask them to say, if they came to the conclusion that the story told by the accused was untrue, that it was an untrue story told not because he was the guilty man, but told because he might have thought it was essential for him to tell a story which would entirely relieve him of the responsibility of having purchased the strychnine on 1st March.

From 31st March Vaquier had said that he understood he was accused of the murder of Jones. Would it not be in the mind of any person accused of a murder of which he was innocent to consider from the beginning every little fact that had been brought to his notice at the particular hotel? Bearing always in mind that this particular accused person was a Frenchman, did they not think that he would have searched his memory for every little incident that had taken place at that hotel? Suspicions had been thrown on Mr. Bruce Millar and against "George." In another statement the accused had shown that he could not have committed this crime, and had pointed out a reason why he would not desire to commit this crime. Instead of fixing upon some person as a guilty man from the beginning, would they not find an innocent man going through his mind for every incident, shifting the suspicion from one person to another, then explaining as to why he should not have wanted to do it, and then, finally, the statement that he was not suspicious of Mrs. Jones?

Vaquier did not know the law of this country, and he might have thought that in the purchase of strychnine, if he had said it was for the purpose of wireless experiments, it might not have been good enough. He submitted that the prosecution had not proved Vaquier guilty. The motive suggested was that there had been a guilty infatuation by Vaquier for Mrs. Jones. He (counsel) suggested that there was no motive upon 29th March for Vaquier to want to murder Mr. Jones. So far as Vaquier was concerned, it was far more advantageous for him

that Mr. Jones should live than that he should die. Vaquier had possessed this woman in Biarritz, Bordeaux, Paris, and the Hotel Russell, but the evidence had tended to show that the guilty infatuation admittedly did not exist on 29th March. From 3rd March there had been no guilty relations between these two people, and, although a passion did at one time exist between them, he submitted that from 3rd March that passion had burnt itself out.

Sir Henry submitted that it was in Vaquier's favour that the accused was the man who suggested that both Mr. and Mrs. Jones should go to France and take the hotel at St. Jean de Luz. Mr. Jones's life, with the asset of the "Blue Anchor" Hotel, was essential for the purchase of the Villa Merien. If Mr. Jones died and his money went to Mrs. Jones, it would all be swallowed up by her creditors. What grounds had the jury for disbelieving the accused's story that he had lent money to Jones? Sir Henry declared that the evidence was against there being a motive at all. If they came to this conclusion that Mr. Jones borrowed £106 from the accused and had another £22 deposited with him, then, again, the motive which Vaquier would have would be that Jones should live and not die.

Mr. Justice Avory (interposing) said he wished to put a question he had omitted on Friday to Superintendent Boshier.

Superintendent Ernest Boshier (recalled).

By Mr. Justice Avory—Was any money at all found in the possession of the accused upon his arrest?—A few shillings only.

Closing Speech for the Defence resumed.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—That was the position—a few shillings only in his possession. He could not benefit by the death of Mr. Jones. He had not got any money. He had lent, according to his story, £106 to Mr. Jones, and was pressing him to get it back. If Mr. Jones lived and had got rid of the Blue Anchor, then they could have gone out with the money so obtained and taken that villa, the villa at St. Jean de Luz, and run it as a hotel and restaurant.

Sir Henry scouted the suggestion that Vaquier bought chloroform for the purpose of chloroforming Mr. Jones. If he had purchased chloroform for the purpose of getting rid of Mr. Jones, did the jury think he would have instructed him (counsel) to remind the chemist that among other things he purchased was chloroform? He put it to the jury that the evidence was conclusive in favour of Vaquier that the amount of strychnine he purchased was under 2 grains. The prosecution could not, and did not, suggest that Vaquier went to any other chemist

for strychnine. Sir Bernard Spilsbury had said that Mr. Jones had taken 2 grains and possibly more on the morning of his death. "If Sir Bernard is correct, this man cannot be the murderer, because that is more than he purchased," declared Sir Henry. The strychnine found in the body was not all the strychnine that was in the bottle. They knew also that some strychnine was picked up from the carpet. Mrs. Jones had told them that the amount of poison found was about half a teaspoonful. He would put it lower than that and make it a quarter of a teaspoonful. The case for the defence was built up from the evidence for the prosecution that this man had taken about 2 grains. The expert called for the Crown said Mr. Jones would have taken 2 grains. Let them put it at 1¾ grains and credit Mrs. Jones with having said a quarter of a teaspoonful and not a half. The whole of what the accused person was said to have bought could have been got into less than a quarter of a teaspoonful. Yet, in addition, they were told that on the floor there were more crystals. There were some left in the bottle. Whatever the quantity was it must have been more, if Sir Bernard Spilsbury was right. The prosecution had failed upon their motive of guilty infatuation, and he submitted that they had failed when they had suggested that the accused man from 1st March bought the poison which killed Mr. Jones because they knew now, if the evidence could be relied upon, that there was more in that bottle than was ever purchased by Vaquier in the name of "Wanker" from Mr. Bland on 1st March.

Referring to the washed-out bottle, Sir Henry submitted that there was no evidence on which they could rely as to whether the accused person washed it out or where he washed it out. Mrs. Jones had said that she went down to get hot water, and Mrs. Fisher told them that Mrs. Jones did not usually go down for hot water, and that she was under the impression that on this particular morning Mrs. Jones called for the hot water over the banisters. Mrs. Jones had also said that when she said to Vaquier, "You assassinated Mr. Jones," the accused, who did not understand English, and could not speak it, replied in English, "Yes, Mabs, for you." The accused had denied that statement in the witness-box, and the Attorney-General had said he was not going to trouble to impress matters of that sort upon them. "No," said Sir Henry Curtis Bennett, "because Mrs. Jones is a witness whose evidence you cannot rely upon."

In concluding, Sir Henry, reminding the jury that Vaquier was a stranger in a strange land, asked them if there was a reasonable doubt in their minds, if they did not think the Crown had satisfactorily proved their case, to say, by their verdict, that the accused was not guilty, and so to allow this ill-starred visit to come to an end and enable Vaquier to return to his native country.

Charge to the Jury.

Mr. Justice Avory—Gentlemen of the jury, the accused is charged with the murder of Alfred George Poynter Jones by poisoning him with strychnine, a form of murder which long years ago was aptly described in the words which I will read to you: "Of all forms of death by which human nature may be overcome the most detestable is that of poison, because it can of all others be the least prevented either by manhood or forethought; and therefore in all cases where a man wilfully administers poison to another or lays poison for him and either he or another takes it and is killed by it, the law implies malice although no particular enmity can be proved." Therefore in this case if you should be driven to the conclusion that the prisoner at the bar laid this poison for the deceased, intending him to take it, it is not necessary either to search for, much less to establish, a motive for his doing it. The accused here is either guilty of murder or he is not guilty of anything. There is no ground upon which in this case it can be suggested that he can be guilty of any lesser offence than that of murder.

I think it will be convenient for you to approach the consideration of this case in this way: first, by asking yourselves: Was the death of the deceased man caused by strychnine poisoning? If it was, secondly, ask yourselves: Was the strychnine from which he died in the bottle of bromo salts from which he took a dose that morning? If you are satisfied of both those propositions, then the final and crucial question in this case is: Who put the strychnine into that bottle which was supposed to contain bromo salts?

Before I deal with either of those questions let me warn you, although I trust it is unnecessary to do so, that your conclusion in this case must be based solely on the evidence which has been laid before you in this Court. You must resolutely discard from your minds any impressions or views that you have formed from anything you may have heard or read before you took your seats in the jury-box; and, particularly, I would warn you against any impression you may have formed by reading what may have taken place before the Coroner in this particular case, having regard to the fact that a Coroner's jury is not bound by the strict laws of evidence as we are in this Court and by which you alone are bound.

To deal with these three questions: Was the death of this deceased man caused by strychnine poisoning? Can you have any doubt of that when you have regard to the evidence of the medical witness, Dr. Carle, who attended him in his last moments, who has described the symptoms, convulsions, who formed the opinion at the time that the man had been poisoned with strychnine, and that view confirmed as it is by Sir Bernard Spilsbury,

Mr Justice Avory

who says that all those symptoms point to death caused by strychnine poisoning? If it were not of itself sufficient to satisfy you, you have the evidence of the eminent analyst that he found in the organs of the body seventeen-thirtieths of a grain of strychnine, and you have the evidence of Sir Bernard Spilsbury that half a grain of strychnine is sufficient to cause death. I will deal with the argument which has been addressed to you by learned counsel for the accused as to the amount of strychnine which was found, and as to the amount which it is alleged was purchased by the accused; I will deal with that at a later stage; at present I am only concerned with pointing out to you the evidence upon which you may think you may safely come to the conclusion that this man in fact died of strychnine poisoning. The second question is: Was the strychnine which caused that poisoning in that bottle of bromo salts on the morning of the 29th March? The evidence that it was there is found first of all in the fact that the same witness, Mr. Webster, tells you that he found traces of strychnine in the bottle even after it had been rinsed out; that is to say, that the liquid which was left in the bottle after it had been rinsed out showed traces of strychnine. He also found traces of strychnine in the tumbler from which the deceased man had drunk, and he found traces of strychnine on the spoon which had been used to stir that dose of what the deceased man supposed was bromo salts. You have further the fact that the moment the deceased man drank it, having taken a dose from this bottle, he exclaimed, "My God, it is bitter," and you have the evidence that a peculiar character of strychnine is its exceedingly bitter taste. You have the further fact that undoubtedly some of the contents of that bottle were dropped upon the floor in that bar parlour. Dr. Carle picked up from the floor some crystals and saw upon the floor what appeared to be some powder, a powder being what you naturally would expect to find at the bottom of a bottle of this description when the granules have been rubbed together for a little time, and those crystals which Dr. Carle picked up from the floor, and which must apparently have been dropped from the contents of that bottle, are found to be strychnine. You must ask yourselves whether you can doubt that the deceased in fact died on that morning of the 29th March from strychnine poisoning, and that the strychnine came from that bottle of bromo salts. Then you come to the final question: Who put the strychnine into that bottle? Some one must have put that strychnine into that bottle of bromo salts. It is proved by an examination of an ordinary bottle of bromo salts that it does not contain any strychnine. It is hardly necessary to prove that, because if bromo salts in itself contained any strychnine the deceased man and several others who had been taking from that bottle would have been dead long before. It appears to be clear, therefore, that it had been introduced since the last person had taken a dose from that bottle. You probably will think that it

must have been introduced either during the night or in the early morning of the 29th March. The prosecution on this crucial question say, first of all, that there is evidence that the accused had the opportunity of introducing that poison into that bottle in the early morning of the 29th March. They say, moreover, that he had such poison in his possession, at all events on 1st March, and therefore may still have had it on the 29th. They say, further, that there is evidence that he must have been the person who rinsed out that bottle so as to conceal the fact that it had contained strychnine; and they say, apart from his movements on that particular morning of the 29th, you should also take into your consideration the fact that on the previous morning, the 28th, his movements in that bar parlour were of an unusual character, and indicated that he was watching for the opportunity of tampering with that bottle, and watching for the opportunity so that the deceased man should be the person to take it.

I think it is right, in considering what his movements were on the morning of the 29th March, that I should direct your attention particularly to the evidence of the witnesses other than Mrs. Jones, the widow. The credibility of Mrs. Jones has been attacked. She has been cross-examined to her credit, as it is called, and it is entirely for you to judge—I express no opinion upon it—whether the immorality to which she has confessed, and whether any of the other suggestions which have been put to her as to her conduct when she was at Kingston, so far destroy her credibility that you are unable to act upon anything that she has said. That is entirely a question for you. It certainly does not follow because a wife has been unfaithful that therefore she is never afterwards to be believed upon her oath, particularly in tragic circumstances such as these; but it is because her credit has been attacked, and because a suggestion has undoubtedly been made by the accused himself, that she may have been a party to the destruction of the life of her husband that I propose, when you consider what the accused's movements were on 29th March, that you should confine your attention to the evidence of the other witnesses, and, although it may be present to your minds, I think it better that I should remind you of what the two important witnesses on this subject have said. They are Mrs. Fisher, the cook, and Mrs. Whitewick, the wife of the manager. You will bear in mind that on this morning the household was not quite in its usual condition because the housemaid, Mrs. Hutley, was away on that morning; consequently the staff was short, and it may be that that is the explanation of Mrs. Jones going down herself for hot water. Although it was suggested that she usually rang for the hot water, sometimes Mr. Jones shouted for it, and, having regard to the fact that Mrs. Fisher, the cook, was there alone on that morning, it is quite possible that a bell was not attended to; it is quite possible even that a shout from Mr. Jones was not promptly attended to, and that may be the explanation of Mrs. Jones going down for the hot

Mr Justice Avory

water. It is difficult to see in what way it is very material whether she did in fact go down for hot water or not, unless it is suggested she took the advantage of that opportunity herself to put this deadly poison into the bottle of bromo salts. Mrs. Fisher, the cook, after describing the accused's arrival at the Blue Anchor on 14th February and his habit of following Mrs. Jones about and never taking his meals unless she was with him, says that she got up at a quarter-past seven on the morning of 29th March, and that when she went down she saw the accused in the kitchen having some coffee. She proceeded to light the kitchen fire. Then the manager, Whitewick, came in. Later Mrs. Whitewick and the two persons who had slept at the hotel that night came down and left before eight o'clock, the two men—Ross and Denley. She then took tea up to Mrs. Jones and the deceased man at twenty minutes to nine; when she went up at that time the accused was in the coffee-room. You will bear in mind that in that coffee-room there was a gas stove which the accused not only knew of, but, according to the evidence of this woman or of Mrs. Whitewick (this woman, I think it is) the accused himself was in the habit of lighting it when he wanted it. He was then in the coffee-room. If he wanted to be warm there is no reason why he should not have stayed either in the coffee-room or in the kitchen. Mrs. Fisher then went to the bar parlour to do the fire, that is, to clean out the grate and to light the fire. The accused followed her into the bar parlour and sat in the armchair with his overcoat over him. This was the 29th March. You must ask yourselves, if it was so cold that he required his overcoat over him to keep him warm, why did he not stay in the coffee-room where there was a fire, where he could have lighted the gas fire, or in the kitchen where there already was a fire? He sits in the armchair with his overcoat over him. Mrs. Fisher says at that time there was a fire in the kitchen. Mrs. Fisher said to him: "Why do not you go into the coffee-room where there is a fire; you will get smothered with dust." Now it is quite true that the accused says he does not understand English. By the 29th March, having lived in this hotel since the 14th February, it is probable that he had, at all events, picked up some words of English, but, quite apart from that, Mrs. Fisher says that she indicated with her hand what she meant. Can you doubt that the accused must have understood quite well when the woman was cleaning the fire, making a dust, and she points to the coffee-room and indicates to him to go to the coffee-room—can you doubt that he understood perfectly well what she meant? But he refused to move, took no notice. She says that on other mornings he had been in the coffee-room. I think he himself said in his evidence that it was his habit to write letters in the morning in the coffee-room. Mrs. Fisher goes on to say that it was only in the last fortnight before the death that the accused got up so early, and he used to light the gas fire in the coffee-room himself. Thereupon she proceeded to rake out the ashes and light

the fire in the bar parlour, and about nine o'clock the deceased man came down. She spoke to him, and the deceased man spoke to the accused, because Mrs. Fisher was still anxious to get him out of the room in order that she might go on with the dusting, and you have been told that the deceased man could speak a little French, and he spoke to the accused in French. Can you doubt that he repeated to the accused what Mrs. Fisher had already endeavoured to convey, namely, that he was to leave the bar parlour so that she might get on with her dusting, and the accused, having been spoken to by the deceased man in this way, did get up and went out of the room as far as the foot of the stairs? The deceased man went upstairs again to his bedroom as you know; but the accused, notwithstanding this second request, which had apparently been made by the deceased man, returns to the bar parlour immediately. Mrs. Fisher then tried another step apparently. She opened the door of the bar parlour which opens into the yard, which would make a draught, and she thought that that might probably induce the accused to leave. All the accused did was to shut the door immediately and to remain in the bar parlour. At twenty minutes past nine Mrs. Fisher took hot water up, and at twenty minutes to ten Mrs. Whitewick took the breakfast up. The deceased man came down about ten o'clock. He went into the yard with Mrs. Fisher and discussed some household matter, and then she saw him go to the bar parlour, she being then in the kitchen. You know now that it was then that the deceased man proceeded to take this dose from the bottle of bromo salts.

The next thing that Mrs. Fisher knows is that Mrs. Jones came to the kitchen, asking for salt and water, came from the bar parlour, took it back with her to the bar parlour, and there is no doubt that she gave that salt and water to her husband, the deceased, in order to make him sick. That is a fact which you must bear in mind if there has been borne in upon your minds any suspicion that Mrs. Jones was in any way responsible for this death. You must ask yourselves, is it likely she would have taken those prompt steps to relieve the man whom she wanted to kill? Is it likely she would have been the person to telephone for the doctor? After Mrs. Jones had taken the salt and water to the bar parlour and given it, as you know she did, to the deceased, shortly after she came to the kitchen, Mrs. Fisher saw her with what appeared to be the blue bottle in her hand. The accused was then standing outside the kitchen door, which was open so that he had a view into the kitchen of what she was doing. Mrs. Jones put the bottle in the drawer of the dresser and made a statement to Mrs. Fisher. Our laws of evidence do not permit that you should know what was said to Mrs. Fisher at that time. There is the fact that she was seen to put the bottle away in that drawer, and that the accused was standing in such a position that he could see what she did and could hear, at all events, even if he could not see, what she

Mr Justice Avory

actually did; Mrs. Fisher says that he could hear the drawer being opened. The next thing that happened was that Mrs. Whitewick made some tea with some soda in it, which you know she gave to the deceased and which made him sick again. Then she saw the deceased being brought from the lavatory by the accused and by Mrs. Whitewick, and Mr. Whitewick was fetched to take the place of Mrs. Whitewick, and the deceased man was carried upstairs. Mrs. Fisher went back to the scullery, which, as you know, opens out of the kitchen. The next thing that happened was that the accused came to that scullery door, must have come through the kitchen in order to come to the scullery door, and he said in English to Mrs. Fisher: "Medicine! Doctor! Quick!" at the same time pointing to the bottle of kruschen salts which was on the shelf of the dresser in the kitchen, in order to indicate that it was wanted. Having picked up that bottle in order to show what it was he wanted he put it back, and you can have no doubt, I think, that he was then asking Mrs. Fisher for the bottle which had been put, as you know, in the drawer; Mrs. Fisher understood him in that sense, and she pointed to the drawer where the bottle had been put. The accused went straight to the drawer and went out of the kitchen. Now if you will just look at the plan for a moment you will see that a person coming out of the kitchen only has to turn to the right for a few steps to be in the lavatory, where presumably there is water, and it is at that moment the prosecution suggest he had the opportunity of rinsing out that bottle. A little later Mrs. Jones and Mrs. Whitewick came to the kitchen, and Mrs. Jones went to the drawer and took out the bottle, and, as she took it out, she again made some statement to Mrs. Fisher.

I think it is useful for you to remember what the accused himself has said on this subject of the bottle and his going to the drawer for it. In one of the statements which he has made, which is marked exhibit No. 30, he says this: "I will always say even if misfortune follows me, as it has so far done, I will always say everywhere, before my judges, if I am to go before them, that the assassin, this cowardly criminal, is still at the Blue Anchor. And this awful person has an accomplice, male or female. I am firm on this point, on the condition that the bottle was washed, as I have been asked at the police station. If the bottle was not washed, there is no accomplice, for Mr. Jones spitting out the water could have introduced some into the bottle which was on the table." I think you should notice that. Here is the accused suggesting that the way in which this liquid may have come into that bottle may have been from Mr. Jones spitting out the water, and in that way might have introduced some into the bottle which was on the table. You have seen the size of the bottle and the size of the neck of it, and you know that after he had taken the dose and put it into the glass of water, Mrs. Jones poured some of the solid contents into her hand, and some of those contents fell on the floor; there was no water in the bottle at that time, we have not

heard a suggestion that there was any water at that time, and why does the accused make this very far-fetched suggestion that the liquid may have got into the bottle by Mr. Jones spitting on to the table? He goes on: "But if this bottle which I only had in my hands a few seconds in front of the woman and without moving away from the front of the drawer where the bottle was put away and which I replaced in this drawer still in the presence of the woman, and this bottle was washed before or after I saw and touched it, then there is an accomplice, male or female, for everybody, even people who have no business in there, always go into this kitchen." So that you see he is admitting in this statement that he did in fact have this bottle in his hand from that drawer. He says he put it back again, but why did he have it in his hand at all? If his object was, when he came down, to fetch that bottle for the doctor, when he said, "Medicine! Doctor! Quick!" if that was his object, why did he not take the bottle to the doctor? Why take it out of the drawer, as he himself admits he did, and put it back again? The prosecution, of course, suggest that what he did was to take it out of the drawer, to go those few steps to the lavatory and rinse it out, and then put it back in the drawer where Mrs. Jones and Mrs. Whitewick found it.

Let me say here one word upon a point, one of those small points which even the learned counsel almost hesitated in putting before you, because, with his experience, he knows that small points of this kind in a case like this are of very little value. There is undoubtedly a discrepancy between the evidence of Dr. Carle and the evidence of Mrs. Jones and Mrs. Whitewick. Dr. Carle says that it was Mrs. Whitewick only who went downstairs to get that bottle. Both Mrs. Jones and Mrs. Whitewick swear quite positively that they went down together for the purpose and came back together, Mrs. Whitewick carrying the bottle. Just imagine, consider what this comes to. Dr. Carle at that time was attending to his patient, he was actually trying to restore respiration in the patient, and to suppose that he could be positive whether one woman left the room or two women left the room to get the bottle is really a matter which is not worth stopping to consider.

No suggestion has been made against the integrity or truthfulness of Mrs. Whitewick, the other witness to whom I am going to call your attention. This is the evidence of Mrs. Whitewick as to the accused's movements on that morning. She says: "On the 29th March I saw the deceased man about twenty minutes to nine in his dressing-gown in the kitchen. I then saw him in the bar parlour. The accused was there then. After the deceased had left and gone upstairs again, as he did, I went into the parlour. The accused was still there. I proceeded to dust the parlour, including the mantelpiece." There again, you see, notwithstanding the repeated requests of Mrs. Fisher and the requests apparently of the deceased man, the accused is persisting in

remaining in the bar parlour even when the process of dusting has commenced and is going on. Mrs. Whitewick says: "I proceeded to dust the bar parlour, including the mantelpiece. There were then two bottles, one an ordinary medicine bottle and the other a small bottle labelled 'Iodine.' There was no blue bottle like this which is produced on the mantelpiece at that time." It is not suggested it was then on the table; Mrs. Whitewick would have seen it if it had been. It seems to be clear that the blue bottle for some reason at that particular time was not on the mantelpiece. While she was dusting the room she saw the accused move the iodine bottle from one side of the clock to the other, that is to say, he was doing something with these bottles on the mantelpiece. Why? Then she took the hot water up to the bedroom. Later she took up breakfast. Later, after Mr. Jones was sick, she made a cup of tea with soda in it; he drank it and was sick again, and she went up to the bedroom after the deceased had been carried there. She says: "I left it on two occasions, first to get brandy, and next by request of the doctor to get the bottle"—that is the bottle of bromo salts—"I and Mrs. Jones went down to the kitchen, and she took the bottle from the drawer, handed it to me, and I took it upstairs to the doctor." After the deceased was dead she heard the accused ask Mrs. Jones: "Is Mr. Jones *couche?*" using the French word, and Mrs. Jones replied: "No, he is dead, and you have done it." The accused replied: "Oh, God, madame, do you accuse me?" and he went on his knees and wept bitterly. Then she speaks of the doctor picking up some of the crystals from the floor. Then she speaks of that incident about the purse. I do not know whether you attach any importance to that. Here, again, it is suggested that there is some discrepancy between the evidence of Mrs. Jones and the evidence of Mrs. Whitewick, because Mrs. Jones says she destroyed a small photograph of the accused some time before the death, and Mrs. Whitewick suggests that it had been destroyed on that morning after the death. Unless you saw some reason to suppose that Mrs. Jones was either the person who put the poison in the bottle or was a party to it, these discrepancies do not seem to be very material. If, as I have already said, any suspicion may have crossed your minds that Mrs. Jones was a party to this, and for that reason you cannot believe her upon her oath, you must bear in mind that the accused himself in almost his final statement has asseverated that Mrs. Jones is entirely innocent. She goes on to say that when the accused protested against the accusation that he had done it, she, Mrs. Whitewick, said to Mrs. Jones: "Do not say any more"—in other words, "Do not continue the discussion."

Another witness is Mrs. Hutley, the housemaid, who was not in the house on that morning, who speaks of the deceased and Mrs. Jones being on good terms. She speaks of that incident when Mrs. Jones went out for a walk and the accused appears to have

been very agitated and thought she might have contemplated committing suicide. Mrs. Hutley says she was in the habit of doing this room in the early morning, and that she always saw that bottle of salts on the mantelpiece or on the table in the bar parlour. She last saw it on the Thursday, has no recollection of seeing it on the Friday morning, and she it is who speaks as to the accused's movements the day before, on the 28th March. "On the 28th March," she says, "the accused followed me into the bar parlour and remained sitting there all the time while I dusted. He had never done that before." Then some of these witnesses were called who were in the house the night before to say that the blue bottle was not on the table or that they never saw it on the table the night before, those witnesses having been called, as I understand, merely because the accused in one of his statements had said that when he went down the night before to get some matches this blue bottle was then on the table. The material question is: Where was it on the morning of the 29th?

Now that in substance is the evidence which the prosecution lay before you, quite apart from the evidence of Mrs. Jones herself, as to what took place on that morning to show that the accused had the opportunity of tampering with that bottle of salts, that he had the opportunity of putting the strychnine into it, and that he had the opportunity of rinsing it out so as to destroy the evidence; and, as I have already pointed out to you, they also place before you the fact that the accused on 1st March was undoubtedly in possession of a certain quantity of strychnine; he was in possession of sufficient strychnine to kill anybody who took it. Learned counsel has presented to you an argument which requires consideration about the quantity of this strychnine. I am assuming you will see no reason to doubt the evidence given by Mr. Bland, the chemist. It is better that I should just remind you of what he says. The accused had been to his shop about the middle of February, he came several times and bought chemicals, such as cobalt nitrate, oxide of tin, nitrate of silver, sodium acetate, copper acetate, and some chloroform; and on 1st March he came, producing a list of chemicals that he wanted. That list included many of these same articles, but it also included 20 grammes of perchloride of mercury, which is commonly called corrosive sublimate, and the list also included .12 of a gramme of strychnine. .12 of a gramme is something slightly less than 2 grains; 2 grains are equal to .13, that is to say, thirteen-hundredths of a gramme. What he had was twelve-hundredth parts instead of thirteen; if he had had thirteen-hundredths he would have had 2 grains. What he had was twelve-hundredths, and therefore you can appreciate that it was only something very slightly less than 2 grains which he had. Now, assuming that he never had any more than that, learned counsel invites you to say, on the evidence of Sir Bernard Spilsbury, that there must have been more than 2 grains used by the person who committed this crime. That is based upon the

statement of Sir Bernard Spilsbury, that, assuming seventeen-thirtieths of a grain is found in the organs after death, and assuming that the deceased had spat out some of the poison, and assuming that he had vomited twice and brought up some of the poison, then he estimates that probably 2 grains must have been taken into the body, taken into the mouth, and possibly more. That, you will observe, is a mere estimate based upon a number of hypotheses. First of all, you are asked, in order to accept that theory, to assume that the man spat out some of the poison. Probably you know the way in which a man, especially one who is a heavy drinker, would drink off a dose of bromo salts, or magnesia, or Epsom salts, or anything of that kind. He would not sip it. Ask yourselves whether he practically would not swallow it all almost in one gulp, and, although it may be true that he was seen to spit, that action of spitting may have been a mere spasmodic action such as is not uncommon with anybody who has got a nasty taste in his mouth. As some people always spit when they get a nasty smell in their noses, so you must yourselves often have seen a person spit as a mere spasmodic action when he has swallowed something which has left an unpleasant taste in his mouth. You cannot be sure, therefore, that the man ever spat out any of this poison, and how much he would have brought up in vomiting is all again a matter of conjecture. You must say whether you think that argument really justifies you in coming to the conclusion that he could not have been the person who put this poison in. because he never had more than 2 grains, and never had, according to the case for the prosecution, quite so much as 2 grains of strychnine, bearing in mind what Sir Bernard Spilsbury has said that, even if there were only half a grain in the dose that he took, that of itself would be enough to cause his death. I was about to read to you further the evidence given by Mr. Bland. He says: "I asked the accused what he wanted these poisons for. The accused said: 'For wireless experiments.' I said I doubted if he could use them for that purpose. The accused replied: 'When I was in France I habitually bought them in any quantity and used them for that purpose.'" This is all untrue, as you know now, and the accused admits that all these statements he was making to the chemist were untrue; he does not suggest that he has ever used strychnine or perchloride of mercury for wireless experiments. The chemist then produced the register from his poisons book. He asked the accused to sign his name to it, after filling in himself the particulars of the poisons which he was supplying. Here they are on exhibit No. 8; 20 grammes of perchloride of mercury and .12 of a gramme of hydrochloride of strychnine. "Purpose for which it is required: Wireless experiments." "Mr. Wanker"—which he wrote down, the accused spelling the name—"No. 60 room, Hotel Russell," and the accused signs his name: "J. Wanker." I will come to his explanation in a moment. Mr. Bland goes on to say that the



Mr. Justice Avory.

accused took the two poisons away with him and came back an hour or two later for the other chemicals, as the chemist had not finished weighing. He it was who on the 16th April, having seen a photograph of the accused in the newspaper, made a communication to the police which, as you know, led three days afterwards to the arrest of the accused. He is cross-examined, and he says: "I am sure that corrosive sublimate was on the list. I am sure that the list did not specify 25 grammes of strychnine," and, he says, "I delivered those two poisons in little packets of paper to the accused, the charge for the strychnine and the sublimate being about 2d. for each. It is not true that he took them all away at the same time." The accused never suggested that he took away all the strychnine that he had ordered, and, further, he said, when he was recalled, that at that time he had not in his possession any such quantity as 25 grammes of strychnine, which would be equal to about 375 grains, which, as the learned Attorney-General pointed out, was enough to poison 740 people.

That being the way in which the case is presented to you by the prosecution, although, as I have reminded you, if you are satisfied that the accused was the person who laid that poison in that place, intending the deceased to take it, it is not necessary that you should look for, much less be satisfied, of any motive for such a crime, the prosecution in this case have put before you a possible motive which the accused might have in desiring the death of Mr. Jones. They suggest that, having regard to the relations which had existed between the accused and Mrs. Jones, commencing at Biarritz, continued at the Hotel Russell as late as the 3rd March—on one occasion, if it was not the 3rd March, on some occasion in February, he even takes her up to his bedroom at the hotel before dinner for the purpose of gratifying his passion—those relations undoubtedly having existed and subsisted up to the 3rd March, the prosecution suggest that he was urging Mrs. Jones to leave her husband in order that he might possess her to himself completely, she was refusing to leave her husband for him, and that that, if it existed, would be, particularly in a man of a Latin race, one of the most powerful motives which might influence him in desiring to get rid of a husband whom Mrs. Jones undoubtedly had some affection for at all events, even though she had been unfaithful to him, whom she was unwilling to leave. That the accused was urging her to leave him does not rest upon the evidence of Mrs. Jones alone, because you will find in one of his statements (exhibit No. 33), one of the statements that he made which begins by the expression, "I say and affirm that Mrs. Jones is absolutely innocent and no doubt is possible. One day after a scene Mrs. Jones went to her room to give full vent to her unhappiness. That evening I saw Mrs. Jones, who was still in deep trouble, and advised her not to live like this, but once for all to leave Mr. Jones"—there is his own admission in his own writing that he had advised her to leave Mr. Jones, and

he goes on, "Mrs. Jones wrote the following which I had translated, 'I always suffer, I have never done wrong, not leave Mr. Jones. I have children.'" In other words, she was saying she would not leave Mr. Jones because she had children. "At Biarritz, at the Victoria Hotel, when she received a letter from Mr. Jones, she was so happy that the tears came to her eyes, and when she received the telegram telling her to come back at once she was very happy. No one could say that Mrs. Jones did not love her husband, for any other woman would never have put up with what she suffered." Although, as I have pointed out to you already twice, it is not necessary in this case to look for a motive if you are once satisfied of the fact that the accused was the person who put that poison there for the deceased to take, of course, you are entitled to take into your consideration evidence which does point to the accused having such a possible motive in his mind, and in considering whether he was influenced by that motive you cannot help taking into your consideration the fact that even up to the last moment here in the witness-box the accused, notwithstanding this evidence of their cohabiting together as man and wife, has persisted in saying that his relations with her were only those of a friend, and in one of those statements actually goes so far as to say that his only feeling towards her was that of a brother and a sister. Yet in face of that he is forced to admit that he was on those terms of intimacy with her at the Hotel Russell, and he makes a point that after they had arrived back at the Blue Anchor at Byfleet those relations had ceased, that after 3rd March there was no further intimacy of that kind between them. But does that in any way militate against the theory which is put forward by the Crown when you find him saying in more than one of these statements: "Of late Mrs. Jones's affection for me, or friendship for me, seems to have vanished." Apparently his experience was that when she was at home with her husband her affection for him disappeared. May it not have been, if the man was really passionately desiring her, that the very fact that he finds she is not affectionate to him while in the presence of her husband, or living in the same house as her husband, may be an additional reason for him desiring that the husband should be put away?

That being the case for the prosecution, it is necessary, of course, that you should consider with equal care the case which has been put forward on behalf of the accused by himself in the witness-box. He might have been content, as he was when he was before the magistrate, with saying: "I am not guilty. It is for you, the prosecution, to prove if you can that I am guilty," because by the law of this country no man is liable to be convicted unless the jury are satisfied beyond any reasonable doubt that he is guilty. He is not called upon to establish his innocence. He is not called upon even to say anything if he chooses to remain silent. But if he does depart from that attitude and sets up an

affirmative defence, the jury are, of course, entitled to take that into consideration, and, if they find that it is an untrue defence, they are entitled to say that that adds weight to the case for the prosecution. It is quite true, as his learned counsel has so forcibly said, that a man who is accused of a crime like this may say to himself: "I must point a finger of suspicion at somebody else in order to clear myself, and therefore I will point it first at one and then at another; I will point it in fact at every one but myself." It is possible to understand such a frame of mind, and if the accused here had been content with saying: "There are other people in that hotel who might have introduced that poison, there are other people in that hotel who were interested in getting rid of Mr. Jones," that would have been a perfectly legitimate argument to place before you; but when he goes further and goes out of his way to put before you an affirmative case that somebody else was really purchasing the strychnine, that that somebody else was a lover of Mrs. Jones, and should you come to the conclusion that the whole of that story is a fabrication, then, although the mere fact that a man has told a false story in the witness-box when he is charged with a crime is not by itself a sufficient reason for convicting him, yet it undoubtedly is a perfectly legitimate thing for the jury to take it into account in conjunction with the evidence for the prosecution. When you find a man putting forward such a story which either you are satisfied is untrue or which is so improbable that it cannot be true, you are entitled to say, if there were any doubt left in the evidence for the prosecution, that that removes any possible doubt.

What is the story which he has put forward? Bear in mind that from 30th March up to the time when the accused was committed for trial he not only had the opportunity, but availed himself of the opportunity, of making statements in writing in relation to this matter; bear in mind that when all the evidence had been given against him before the magistrates, including the evidence of Mr. Bland, the chemist, of the purchase of this strychnine by him, at the conclusion of that evidence he was asked if he wished to say anything in answer to the charge, and that anything he did say would be taken down in writing. He contented himself with saying: "I am not guilty." And not in any one of those statements, many of them very voluminous, which he had written, nor in the statement which he made early at the police station on 30th March, is there a trace of this suggestion that somebody else had employed him to buy this strychnine for the purpose of killing a dog or representing that it was wanted for that purpose. It is not unworthy of notice that in one of those statements he has said: "I will to-morrow disclose who it was who has bought the poison." He never did disclose it, and until yesterday no person concerned in this case for the prosecution could have had any reason to suppose that this story about Mr. Bruce Millar was going to be put forward by the accused. What is this story? Even if you are

Mr Justice Avory

not satisfied with the absolute denial which has been given by Mr. Bruce Millar, the solicitor, and against whom no suggestion has been made as to his character or reputation—even if you were not satisfied with that denial, could you for a moment believe that the story which the accused has told, which is that on the second occasion that he had ever seen this gentleman at the Blue Anchor, and never spoken to him in his life, the accused being a man who cannot speak English, this stranger should have called him into the lounge, and after speaking about Mrs. Jones's bankruptcy—the very last thing a solicitor should have done, if he ever did it, discussing his client's affairs with a stranger—this stranger said to the accused: "I want you to get me some strychnine; I have got a dog which has the mange and I want you to get me some strychnine for the purpose of killing it." The accused said: "Oh, yes, I am quite ready to get it; I can get you any quantity." Why did he not say to this man: "Why do not you get it yourself? Where do you live; do you live in London?"—"Yes." "There are plenty of chemists' shops in London; why do not you get it yourself?" No, that did not occur to him, and this stranger hands him a pound note to get strychnine for the purpose of killing a dog; two pennyworth would have done it. He hands him a pound note, never asks him for the change, and it never occurs to the accused to volunteer to give him the change. It does not stop there. He says that this man, the solicitor, told him, "When you go and buy strychnine at a chemist's you must give a false name, because people who buy strychnine always give false names at a chemist's," and for that reason he gave that false name "Wanker" at the chemist's. Well, I think I am not doing the learned counsel who has so ably defended the accused any injustice when I say that he truly described his position when he said that the duty of counsel is only to put their client's case before the jury; they are not responsible for what the client may say, and they cannot take the responsibility of advising the client in such circumstances as the present that such a story as that would never be believed in a Court of justice. He has put it before you. He has asked you, even if you do not believe it, even if you think it is all a fabrication, nevertheless to say that it is only a desperate resource of this man who thinks that he is bound to find some explanation for his purchasing of this strychnine. But that argument overlooks one important feature in this case, and that is, what has become of the perchloride of mercury, the corrosive sublimate which was delivered to the accused on 1st March and which Mr. Bland swears was delivered to him in a separate packet, 20 grammes of it, a deadly poison? The accused's only answer is that that is all untrue, that there never was any perchloride of mercury on the list, and that none was ever delivered to him. If you believe Mr. Bland, ask yourselves what was that bought for? How is it that there is no explanation forthcoming? How is it that there was not somebody else at

the Blue Anchor who asked him to buy some perchloride of mercury in order to kill a cat? You might just as well have been asked to believe that.

Gentlemen, if there is the evidence of any witness about whom there may be any difference of opinion between you and you desire your memories to be refreshed, I shall be happy to refresh it by reading my note to you. That is all I propose to say to you without going into further detail in this case.

You have heard the statements made by the accused carefully read to you, and I have no doubt they are present to your minds. Bear in mind the principle upon which this and other criminal trials are conducted in this country, namely, that you must be satisfied beyond any reasonable doubt of the guilt of the accused before you convict him. If you are not so satisfied, it is your duty to acquit him. I will ask you now to retire and discharge the duty which you have undertaken by your oaths, that is, to find a true verdict according to the evidence, regardless of the consequences and regardless of everything except your desire to do justice between the Crown and the accused. Will you now consider your verdict?

The jury retired at 3.42 p.m. and returned into Court at 5.23 p.m.

The Clerk of Assize—Gentlemen of the jury, are you agreed upon your verdict?

The Foreman of the Jury—We are.

The Clerk of Assize—Do you find the prisoner at the bar, Jean Pierre Vaquier, guilty or not guilty?

The Foreman—Guilty.

The Clerk of Assize—Jean Pierre Vaquier, you stand convicted of wilful murder. Have you anything to say why judgment of death should not be pronounced upon you acording to law?

Jean Pierre Vaquier—Monsieur le President——

Mr. Justice Avory—I can only listen to any reason in law why I should not pronounce sentence upon you.

Jean Pierre Vaquier—I can only say that I am innocent. I swear on my mother's and my father's graves, still fresh, that I am quite innocent of the crime of which I have been accused.

Sentence.

Mr. Justice Avory—Jean Pierre Vaquier, you have been convicted by the jury of the most serious crime known to the law of

any civilised country. I can see no reason whatever to doubt the righteousness of that verdict. You have been tried according to the law and procedure of this country, which are more favourable to the interests of the accused than the laws of other countries, and you have had further the advantage of being defended by one of the most able and experienced counsel at the English bar. Having been so convicted, it is my duty to pronounce upon you the sentence which is prescribed by law for this wicked and detestable crime. That sentence is that you be taken from this place to a lawful prison and thence to a place of execution, that you be there hanged by the neck until you be dead, and that your body be afterwards buried within the precincts of the prison wherein you shall have been last confined before your execution. And may the Lord have mercy upon your soul!

The Chaplain—Amen.

Jean Pierre Vaquier—You have given an iniquitous verdict——

Mr. Justice Avory—I can listen to nothing more. Let him be removed.

[The accused continued to make further observations in French which were not interpreted.]

APPENDIX I.

Re THE APPEAL REX *v.* VAQUIER.

Take notice that in addition to the grounds of appeal already delivered, the point will be raised that there was not proper material before the learned judge to enable him to exercise his discretion that the jury should consist of men only.

ARTHUR B. LUCY.

To the Registrar,
Court of Criminal Appeal.

GROUNDS OF APPEAL OR APPLICATION.

To the President of the Court of Appeal.

Sir,

The undersigned, Jean Pierre Vaquier, engineer, Frenchman, condemned to death at the Guildford Court of Assizes on the 5th instant, begs you to be good enough to devote a few minutes to the perusal of the present petition.

The appeal which I solicit from you, sir, is based upon new facts. They will make it clear to you whether my application is justified or not.

None of the witnesses whose names follow were ever called, and their names were never mentioned.

1. Captain Vivian, *The Daily Mirror*, London.
2. Mr. Budgen H., late reporter *Daily Mail.*

P.V. 3.

4. Mr. Schulte, interpreter, 68 Torrington Square, London.

P.V. 5.

The first two witnesses are those to whom three days before my arrest I told the frightful truth, and that at a time when I was absolutely free.

The third relates to these confidences.

The fourth is the interpreter who came to the Blue Anchor to translate our conversation (mine and Mrs. Jones), relating to my loan of money to Mr. Jones.

The fifth finally relates to a request for money which I did not grant (on the advice of Mrs. Jones).

The other facts of exceptional gravity taken separately would be deemed sufficiently grave in order that the President should think fit to allow my application.

In point of fact Mrs. Jones says : "I went down with Mrs. Whitewick to look for the bottle of bromo salts."

This is false.

Mrs. Whitewick went down alone. (The deposition of Dr. Carle is specific on this point.)

Mrs. Jones further says: "I went down to get some water."

This is false.

Mrs. Jones never left the doctor.

The doctor is categorical on this point also.

Mrs. Whitewick states: "Yes; I picked up salts with the doctor." And this woman goes so far as to mark with a cross on the photograph shown her the place where she says she was.

It is false.

Sir, look at the depositions of the Honourable Dr. Carle at the Court of Woking. Dr. Carle categorically denies that the woman Whitewick was there *at any moment.*

Who searched the body of Mr. Jones and ensured the disappearance of the receipt for money which Mr. Jones had in his pocket?—Mrs. Jones in the presence of the woman Whitewick.

With regard to the glass from which Mr. Jones drank the poison and which Mrs. Whitewick brought up to the doctor with the bottle, *it was never mentioned*! Just as if this glass had never existed!

Where had Mrs. Jones hidden it?

Where did Mrs. Whitewick find it?

Who washed it? *Because this glass was washed.*

Sir, I am not a criminal, I am not the murderer of Mr. Jones.

The judge misdirected the jury inasmuch as he failed to put before it the argument concerning the quantity of strychnine which was found on the floor and the traces of the same product found in the bottle, the fact being that Sir Bernard Spilsbury declared that 2 grains of strychnine and perhaps more had been found in the body of the victim.

He also misdirected the jury in so far as concerns the absence of motives for the crime. He likewise did not mention the money which I had lent to Mr. Jones.

Consequently the verdict was given against the weight of evidence.

(Sgd.) P. VAQUIER.

[Extracted from *The Times*, 29/7/24, and reproduced by the courtesy of the Editor.]

REX *v.* VAQUIER.

COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL.

(Before the LORD CHIEF JUSTICE, Mr. Justice SHEARMAN, and Mr. Justice SANKEY.)

The Court refused the application for leave to appeal against conviction of Jean Pierre Vaquier, who was recently convicted at Guildford Assizes of the murder of George Alfred Poynter Jones, the licensee of the Blue Anchor Hotel, Byfleet, Surrey, and who was sentenced to death.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett, K.C., and Mr. A. B. Lucy appeared for the applicant; the Attorney-General (Sir Patrick Hastings, K.C.) and Mr. H. D. Roome for the Crown.

Appendix I.

Vaquier's grounds of appeal were as follows :—

The judge misdirected the jury as he failed to put before it the argument concerning the quantity of strychnine which was found on the floor at the Blue Anchor and the traces of the same product found in the bottle, the fact being that Sir Bernard Spilsbury declared that 2 grains of strychnine, and perhaps more, had been found in the body of the victim.

He also misdirected the jury so far as concerned the absence of motives for the crime.

He likewise did not mention the money which Vaquier had lent to Mr. Jones.

Consequently, the verdict was against the weight of evidence.

There was no proper material before the learned judge to enable him to exercise his discretion that the jury should consist of men only.

The Court was crowded with members of the bar and of the public, and a large number of women obtained admission. M. Jean Odin, the French lawyer, who came to this country to advise Vaquier, occupied a seat at the solicitor's table in front of Vaquier's counsel. Next to him sat the solicitor to the French Consulate.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett, in opening the appeal, said that he would ask the Court for leave to call some new witnesses on one or two important matters. He related the story which has already been fully reported of the relationship between Vaquier and Mrs. Jones, and of Vaquier's going to stay at the Blue Anchor Hotel, and said that the prosecution alleged that on 1st March Vaquier went to the shop of a chemist named Bland in Southampton Row, W.C., and bought .12 of a gramme of strychnine, and that he then intended to murder Jones when the opportunity offered. After describing the scene on 29th March at the Blue Anchor Hotel when Jones took a dose of salts containing strychnine and died shortly afterwards, counsel said that in his submission Mrs. Jones was a witness who could not be believed, and he would draw attention to the way in which Mr. Justice Avory at the trial dealt with the discrepancies between her evidence and that of Mrs. Whitewick, the wife of the manager of the hotel, about the events of the morning of 29th March.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett continuing, said that a very important matter in the case was the question of the photographs of Vaquier which had been in Mrs. Jones's possession. Mrs. Jones said in the witness-box that she had burned a small photograph of Vaquier about a fortnight before Jones's death. After Jones's death she was seen acting in a suspicious manner, taking something from her handbag and going to the lavatory, which was next to her husband's room, and when she dropped the handbag on the stairs afterwards it was found to contain nothing. Whenever the evidence of Mrs. Jones, Mrs. Whitewick, and Mrs. Fisher, the servant, could be tested, it was as unsatisfactory at it could be. Mrs. Jones was contradicted by Mrs. Fisher and Mrs. Whitewick; Mrs. Whitewick was contradicted by Mrs. Fisher, by the doctor who was called to attend Jones, and by Mrs. Jones on really material matters. Mrs. Fisher might be considered to be the most trustworthy witness.

The Lord Chief Justice—The jury, as contrasted with the members of this Court, had the great advantage of seeing and hearing the witnesses themselves.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—I quite appreciate that, but I am going to suggest that the way in which this case was put to the jury was not proper.

Mr. Justice Shearman—All these matters were pointed out to the jury by you.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—To the best of my ability, but sometimes "pointing out" by counsel does not have on a jury the effect which perhaps it ought. (Laughter.)

Mr. Justice Shearman—I think that in most cases, particularly in capital cases, the jury pay the most minute attention to what counsel say.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—The crucial point at the end of a trial is the way in which the judge leaves the matter to the jury.

Turning to the evidence about the strychnine, counsel said that the amount bought from Mr. Bland, the chemist, on 1st March was .12 grammes, or just less than 2 grains. Sir Bernard Spilsbury, taking into consideration the facts that Mr. Jones had spat out some of the salts after taking them, that he had been very sick, and that seventeen-thirtieths of a grain was found in the organs after death, said that in his view Mr. Jones had taken nearly 2 grains of strychnine, and possibly more. If that had stood alone the quantity of strychnine bought by Vaquier would just have been accounted for, but Mrs. Jones had said that she had poured out into her hand about half a teaspoonful of the contents of the bottle, which, she said, contained more crystals (of strychnine) than salts. The whole of 2 grains of strychnine would only fill a quarter of a teaspoon. But, dividing the quantities spoken of by Mrs. Jones and dividing the quantities given by Sir Bernard Spilsbury, there must have been at least 3½ grains of strychnine in the bottle of salts. Vaquier had bought rather less than 2 grains. In those circumstances, who had put the strychnine in the bottle?

Mr. Justice Shearman—All this depends on how much Jones brought up when he was sick. How can you tell, when a man spits out something nasty, how much he spits out and how much he swallows, or, when he is sick, how much remains in his stomach?

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—I am quite content to say that Sir Bernard Spilsbury, in fairness to the appellant, overestimated the amount. It is a point which ought to have entitled Vaquier to an acquittal at once, but, by mistake, the point was not put to the jury by the judge in his summing-up in a way which was of any value.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett then referred to the statements made to the police by Vaquier after his arrest, and he dwelt on the fact that Vaquier was ignorant of English criminal law and procedure.

Appendix I.

The Lord Chief Justice—It used to be said that ignorance of the law excused nobody. The way in which you are putting it is that ignorance of the law excuses wild and reckless statements.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—I put it that ignorance of our law and knowledge of the law of another country might excuse them. At every moment Vaquier was expecting that there would be some reconstruction of the crime, that some one would confront him with allegations; at every moment he thought that he was going to be entitled to confront others. It is to be understood that a man with such an impression in his mind did not realise that all that he need have done was to have kept perfectly quiet and to have said nothing.

Mr. Justice Sankey—What point are you going to make of this?

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—I submit that the judge ought to have pointed out to the jury the difficulty that this man found himself in, and that these allegations which the Attorney-General rightly described as "wild" might have been made under the impression to which I have referred. I submit that the judge should have directed the jury on the matters which had been urged to show absence of motive, namely, that Jones and Vaquier were very good friends, that Vaquier had lent Jones a considerable sum of money, that it had been suggested that Vaquier and Jones should go to St. Jean de Luz and take a hotel together there, and that since 3rd March there had been no intimate relations between Vaquier and Mrs. Jones.

The Lord Chief Justice—It was in evidence that Vaquier had asked Mrs. Jones to leave her husband.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—I submit that women should not have been excluded from the jury. I submit that Mr. Justice Avory, in ordering that only male jurors should be sworn to try Vaquier, had not exercised judicially the discretion conferred on him by section 1 (b) of the Sex Disqualification (Removal) Act, 1919.

The Lord Chief Justice—This was a case of murder, and it was being tried at Guildford. There might be considerable difficulty in cases of murder in finding suitable accommodation for a mixed jury for several nights.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—Is it to be said that in assize towns in this country persons are to be tried by men only merely for reasons of accommodation? I know of no case in which such a course has been taken before. Counsel submitted that directly the power was given to women to try cases, whatever was one's private opinion of the measure, the Act entitled every one, unless there was some special reason, to take his chance of being tried by men and women. Replying to the Court, counsel said that there ought to be a new trial.

The Lord Chief Justice—At what stage did the order made by the judge come to your knowledge?

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—During the course of the trial.

The Lord Chief Justice—Did you make any representations about it?

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—No. That would have been an impossible course to take, that the proviso in the Act of 1919 was intended to secure the exclusion of women from juries in certain sexual offences. I am applying for leave to call certain additional evidence. The first part of that evidence consists of that of two witnesses to whom, it was alleged, Vaquier made a statement before his arrest that he had bought strychnine at the instance of the third party who had been named in the case. The second part of the evidence was of the greatest importance. Since his conviction —on 9th July—Vaquier made a statement to Major Watkins, who had been interpreter between Vaquier and his legal advisers. Major Watkins at once put the matter before the authorities. The evidence was additional to that given by Vaquier at the trial.

The Lord Chief Justice—Is it not apparent that that evidence might have been given at the trial?

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett—This statement was not known to any one appearing on behalf of the defence until 9th July. Vaquier gives his reason for not making it before.

The Lord Chief Justice—If this sort of thing is to be allowed, the oath to be taken by prisoners will have to be altered to "I swear to tell the truth, five-eighths of the truth, and nothing but the truth. I will keep the remaining three-eighths for the Court of Criminal Appeal."

Mr. Justice Shearman—You are asking leave to recall your client to give evidence which he suppressed at the trial.

Counsel for the Crown were not called on to argue.

The Lord Chief Justice, in giving the judgment of the Court, said that the evidence adduced at the trial was ample to show that Jones had died from strychnine poisoning, and that he had got that dose of strychnine in the dose of salts which he took. It was, however, contested that Vaquier had put the strychnine into the bottle of salts.

Sir Henry Curtis Bennett had criticised the discrepancies on minor details between the evidence of Mrs. Jones and that of other persons who were at the Blue Anchor Hotel on the morning of 29th March. It was sufficient to say that the jury apparently took a view of that evidence which they were entitled to take. Point had also been made of the quantities of strychnine of which evidence had been given, and it had been argued that Mr. Justice Avory had not done justice to the argument founded on those calculations. In the opinion of the Court an excellent and admirable summing-up was not open to criticism of that or of any other matter. The question of the quantity of strychnine was fully threshed out before the jury by counsel, and the judge put it to the jury with the greatest force and clearness.

It had further been argued that there had been an irregularity in that women jurors, at the instance of the judge, were excluded from the jury. It was clear that section 1 (b) of the Act of 1919 gave a judge power, in his discretion and at his own instance, to order that the jury be composed of men only or of women only, as the case required. The existenece of the judge's order had come to the knowledge of counsel for the defence at the end of the first or of the second day of the trial, but no observation was made on the matter. It was now said that the course which the judge had taken amounted to a mistrial, and that the proceedings had to start afresh. No particular ground on which the judge was said to have exercised his discretion had been mentioned. It was easy to conceive of various grounds on which that discretion might have been exercised. It was neither useful nor convenient to use words which might seem to fetter the judicial discretion which the section bestowed. That discretion was to be exercised judicially and reasonably, but there was nothing in the circumstances of that case to show that Mr. Justice Avory did not exercise properly the wide discretion which the section conferred on him.

Finally, it was said that further evidence ought to be heard. That evidence had been divided into two parts. The first was evidence of statements made by Vaquier before the trial to other persons. Unless something had arisen to make those statements evidence they could not be admitted. The second part of the suggested evidence purported to show that after the trial Vaquier made certain statements to another person. It was admitted that Vaquier had the evidence in his mind at the trial, but he chose to suppress it. He, if any one, must give the additional evidence. The evidence which it was sought to give was that Vaquier was aware of a large quantity of strychnine concealed in the wall of the Blue Anchor Hotel not far from the place where Mr. Jones took the fatal dose of salts, that he (Vaquier) had access to it, and that Mrs. Jones also knew of it. Vaquier had made every kind of attack on Mrs. Jones at the trial. The further evidence would only have carried those attacks a little further. But it was abundantly plain that on the admission of that statement the whole argument based on the discrepancy between the quantity of strychnine found in the body of Jones and elsewhere and the quantity bought by Vaquier would disappear for ever. If the evidence were accepted it would appear that there was a considerable store of strychnine to which Vaquier had access.

It would be intolerable if an accused at his trial could exercise a mental reservation and so enable a particular defence to be set up, and after that defence had failed to go to the Court of Criminal Appeal and say that he desired to tell the rest of his story and to put forward another defence. It was said in the present case as some tepid excuse that Vaquier was not English. English or French, or belonging to any other nation, no man put on his trial in this country could exercice mental reservations at the trial and afterwards seek to amend his defence in the Court of Criminal Appeal. There was nothing in the case at all except that it happened to be a capital charge, and the application must be refused.

When Vaquier was informed of the result of his application he clung to the rails of the dock, and shouted : " Je demande la justice ! " He was with difficulty removed from the dock.

APPENDIX II.

EXHIBITS.

1. Plan.
2. Photographs.
3. Statement by prisoner, 30th March, 1924.
4. Do. 31st March, 1924.
5. Do. 5th April, 1924.
6. Do. 10th April, 1924.
7. Do. (on arrest), 19th April, 1924.
8. Extract from Sales of Poisons Book, 1st March, 1924.
9. Negative of prisoner taken at Biarritz.
10. Positive of prisoner taken at Biarritz.
11. Negative of Mrs. Jones taken at Biarritz.
12. Positive of Mrs. Jones taken at Biarritz.
13. Postcard, Mrs. Jones to prisoner, 16th January, 1924.
14. Postcard, Mrs Jones to prisoner, 17th January, 1924.
15. Hotel Bill at Hotel Bayonne.
16. Telegram, prisoner to Mrs. Jones, 12th February, 1924.
17. Extract from Visitors' Book, Blue Anchor Hotel, Byfleet, 14th February, 1924.
18. Cheque for £14 on National Provincial, &c., Bank, Kingston-on-Thames, drawn by A. Jones, 3rd December, 1923.
19. Pink paper—advertisement of Schulte.
20. Note in pencil in prisoner's writing.
21. Note in ink in prisoner's writing.
22. Sausage machine.
23. Bottle of medicine.
24. Russell Hotel Register, 9th February, 1924.
25. Aliens' Registration Form (prisoner), 9th February, 1924.
26. Prisoner's bill at Hotel Russell, 16th February, 1924.
27. Extract from Register of Hotel Russell, 3rd March, 1924.
28. Prisoner's bill at Hotel Russell, 3rd March, 1924.
29. Translation of exhibit No. 4.
30. Translation of exhibit No. 5.
31. Translation of exhibit No. 6.
32. Document written by prisoner in French.
33. Translation of exhibit No. 32.
34. Hotel bill, Palais d'Orsay (found on arrest).
35. Prisoner's passport (found on arrest), 8th February, 1924.
36. Mr. Webster's report, 2nd June, 1924.
37. Bottle of bromo seltzer.

38. Tumbler and spoon.
39. Bottle of bromo seltzer.
40. Envelope containing crystals.
41. Sir B. H. Spilsbury's report, 22nd May, 1924.
42. Plan and description of proposed Hotel at St. Jean de Luz.

Exhibit No. 3.

STATEMENT BY PRISONER, 30TH MARCH, 1924.

Surrey Constabulary.

Woking Division,
30th day of March, 1924.

Station : Woking.
Name : Jean Pierre Vaquier (French).
Address : The Hotel Victoria, Biarritz.
Age : 44. Born 14/7/1879.
Occupation : Engineer.

Statement : I was born at Niort, Dept. Aude, France, on the 14th July, 1879. I am married, but living apart from my wife. We had a mutual agreement to separate in 1920.

I first met Mrs. Jones in the early part of February this year at the Hotel Victoria, Biarritz. At the time I was giving lectures on radio-telephony at Biarritz, and I made her acquaintance at one of these lectures that she attended. She told me that she had left England owing to her bankruptcy and was on a circular tour in Pau, Lourdes, and return to Biarritz. I did not accompany her on this tour, but saw her again on her return. It was generally known at the hotel that Mrs. Jones was a married woman. My relations with her were only that of a friend. We certainly did not cohabit.

As a lecturer on radio-telephony I stay at Biarritz four months in the year, and for the remainder tour France. On Mrs. Jones's return to England I accompanied her, as I had a patent that I wanted to get on the British market. I travelled with her to Paris and thence (alone) to England. To be able to do this I got my passport through in 24 hours. I paid all her expenses on the journey as an act of courtesy, as she was travelling with me. Arrived in England on 18/2/24.

In London I stayed at the Hotel Russell, and whilst there sent a wire (and received telephone) inviting me to the Blue Anchor, Byfleet. I arrived at the Blue Anchor on the 17th February, 1924, and met Mr. Jones (the deceased). He was ill at the time. Soon after Mr. Jones asked me if I could oblige him with a loan and on the 19th February I advanced him £108. On the 21st February I also paid him £22 as a deposit against my bill for board and lodging at the hotel.

As I was unable to dispose of my patent, and wished to return to France, on the 25th March I asked for the return of my money. Mr. Jones told me to oblige him by waiting another 10 or 15 days. So far as I know Mrs. Jones was not aware of the transaction. I was rather

worried about this money as Mr. Jones was often sending to the Bank at Kingston.

I went to bed on Friday the 28th March at 11 p.m. At that time there were four or five persons in the hotel besides myself. I only knew one of them, a young man of about 20 who owes Mr. Jones some money. At 12 midnight I went downstairs for some matches. I wanted these matches to enable me to smoke. I often smoke in the night as I suffer from sleeplessness. When I got downstairs I found Mrs. Jones asleep in a chair in the bar parlour. Mr. Jones was also there very lightly clad. On the table there were about 40 empty glasses and amongst them a blue bottle of "Bromo" salts. I asked Mr. Jones if he had been unwell. He replied, "No, why?" I pointed out the bottle on the table. Mr. Jones then said "Oh, I never take them at night, but in the morning." There were four or five other persons in the bar besides Mr. and Mrs. Jones. I went back to bed after getting the matches.

I got up at 7 a.m. on Saturday morning. I am an early riser and am always up at 7 a.m. or earlier. While at the Blue Anchor I was always up first and used to get myself coffee and go for a walk before breakfast. I noticed that the glasses were still on the table.

Mrs. Jones came downstairs at 8 a.m. and was followed by Mr. Jones at about 9 a.m. The bottle of "Bromo" salts was on the mantelpiece. Jones had his back towards me when he drank the dose. I heard him exclaim that it was bitter. Mrs. Jones then emptied the bottle into her hand and tasted it by moistening her finger. She found it bitter also and shot the lot from her hand into the fire. She wholly emptied the contents of the bottle into her hand. I tried to stop her from throwing them into the fire by shouting, "Stop : save them for the doctor," but was too late. She tried to rub some particles that still adhered to her palm back into the bottle, after which she took the bottle away to the kitchen. Mr. Jones had then gone to the lavatory. I afterwards helped the manager, George, to get him to bed.

I am a small drinker. I have on two occasions helped Mr. Jones to bed as he was drunk. I have never known him to vomit as a result of having too much to drink.

I have often heard Mr. and Mrs. Jones quarrelling in their bedroom. One morning, after having a terrific quarrel, Mrs. Jones went off and I and others thought that she would commit suicide. Mr. Jones was not kind to her and treated her badly.

Exhibit No. 4.

STATEMENT BY PRISONER, 31ST MARCH, 1924.

Blue Anchor Hotel,
Byfleet, Surrey.

Par l'attitude du personnel de la maison, et mon interrogatoire d'hier, je comprends enfin que je suis accusé de la mort de M. Jones.

Appendix II.

Cet homme que j'affectionnais et que j'aimais comme un frère est la victime d'un lâche jaloux de ma présence ici. Mr. Jones n'était aucunement jaloux de moi et pour cause. Mais pour d'autres ma présence était gênante. J'ai imposé le respect pour Mr. et Mme. Jones et cela n'était pas pour plaire aux habitués de cette maison de plaisir.

Je dis que si le poison qui a tué Mr. Jones n'a pas été versé dans son verre par le criminel lui même (criminel involontaire peut-être) il a été versé par un domestique à la solde de ce lâche prétendant, et a pour but, pour moi étranger, à me faire inculper de cette horrible tragédie.

Je n'étais pas jaloux de Mr. Jones, je n'en avais pas le droit, car aucune relation intime n'existait entre moi et Mme. Jones ici. Et je peux dire que si jamais une idée aussi lâche et criminelle avait pu germer dans mon cerveau, il m'était bien plus facile à moi de me débarasser de Mr. Jones le soir lorsque personne n'était présent, et Mr. Jones ivre mort.

Je n'aurai jamais versé de poison dans un flacon à la disposition de tous et au risque de tuer n'importe qui.

Il y a 8 jours je ne demandais qu'une chose; repartir avec mon argent, car Mr. Jones à qui je demandais de me rendre ma petite fortune me dit que ma présence à "Blue Anchor," faisait éloigner les habitués, et que je m'occupais un peu trop de choses qui ne me régardaient pas, 'allusion au respect que j'imposais pour Mme. Jones.

Encore une fois, je dis que le poison a été versé le samedi entre 11 heures du soir et dimanche 7 h. du matin, heure où je suis descendu à l'office.

Ce lâche, s'il a accompli son crime pour posséder le bien de Mme. et Mr. Jones, ignorait certainement que l'hotel est au nom de Mr. Jones, que Mme. Jones est en faillite, et que le tout, en cas de décès de Mr. Jones revient par moitié à Mme. Jones et aux enfants. Mais Mme. Jones a encore 2,000 livres de passifs et les créanciers ont pris sur ce qui revient à Mme. Jones. Ce qui fait que Mme. Jones ne possède rien. Si le lucre a guidé la main de ce lâche assassin il s'est trompé.

Ou bien, faire disparaître deux hommes simplement pour assouvir sa passion et me faire accuser d'un crime que je ne commettrais même complètement fou.

Je n'ai jamais déclaré à Mr. Jones le grand amour pour Mme. Jones comme d'autres se sont permis de le faire.

(Mme. Jones m'avait écrit cela, mais elle a exigé que je lui rende quelques papiers d'amitié qu'elle m'avait écrits.) C'est parmi ces prétendants amoureux qu'il est possible de trouver ce lâche assassin qui fait planer sur un honnête homme la suspicion d'avoir commis le plus affreux et le plus lâche assassinat qui ait été perpétré.

Ce matin, les portes sont fermées à clef mais les fénêtres ouvertes, précaution inusitée, et bien inutile pour moi, car un homme qui n'a rien à se reprocher ne cherche pas à fuir.

Si Mme. Jones voulait parler, elle seule peut, peut-être, savoir celui qui a tout intérèt à se débarasser de moi et Mr. Jones.

L'attitude de Mme. Jones à mon égard est inexplicable. Hier matin en montant les escaliers et alors que j'étais dans l'office Mme. Jones, qui

était accompagnée, me montra le poing en prononçant des paroles que je ne comprends pas. Ce geste est significatif, il est accusateur. Le soir, Mme. Jones accepte de prendre l'apéritif avec moi et ces Messieurs de la Sureté, m'invite à aller causer au salon et redescend dîner avec moi et son fils.

Vers 16 h. elle vint dans la salle à manger avec plusieurs personnes, me signifia de quitter la maison en me disant " bagages." Cela me fit bien mal et je suis allé me promener avec le chien. Le soir je rentre à la chambre et prépare ma valise, la descends, et demande au garçon de téléphoner pour un taxi. A ma descente je recontre ces M.M. de la Sureté qui me prient de rester. Et Mme. Jones vint alors me dire devant ces M.M. de la Sureté que *jamais* elle ne m'avait signifié de partir. Mme. Jones nia m'avoir dit cela, sans doute sur les conseils de son amant, ce qui ferait, supposer que je désirais fuir.

C'est le soir même que j'accompagnais Mme. Jones malgré elle chez son avocat (la veille ou avant veille de l'audience au Tribunal de Quinstown) que Mme. Jones, que je menaçais de repartir de la station même de Waterloo si je ne l'accompagnais jusque chez son avocat que Mme. Jones me dit dans les sous-sols de Waterloo, que vu ma jalousie, toute amitié entre nous n'existait plus et que tout était bien fini et que je pouvais repartir à Byfleet et en France. Alors je décidai d'accompagner Mme. Jones et jusqu'au domicile de l'avocat nous ne prononçâmes aucune parole. Nous allâmes prendre le thé vers 18 h. avec son amant et rentrions à Byfleet. C'est ce clerc d'avocat qui accompagna hier une servante au commissariat. C'est ce même monsieur qui déclara à Mr. Jones qu'il aimait éperdument sa femme. Declaration de Mr. Jones et aussi Mme. Jones à moi. Mme. Jones m'avait écrit cela, mais ce papier, comme les autres, a disparu au feu.

La femme du garçon me pria un jour à la cuisine devant l'autre femme, de lui trouver une bonne place à Biarritz. Sur mon affirmation je compris que cette femme était satisfaite. Le soir, vers minuit, je disais cela à Mr. Jones et lui faisais part de mon étonnement de ce que cette femme quittât son mari. Mr. Jones me dit que jamais Georges ne quitterait Blue Anchor et malgré qu'il gagnerait 5 livres par jour en France et ne voulut, malgré mon insistance, en dire plus long, je compris.

Quel est le mobile qui fait que Mme. Jones, m'accuse de la mort de Mr. Jones? Sous quelle impulsion agit-elle? Peut-elle dire que jamais j'ai proféré une menace contre son mari que j'affectionnais parce que très bon, et avec qui j'avais decidé d'aller en France, Mr. Jones était très enthousiaste de vendre l'hotel et venir, à St. Jean de Luz exploiter un hotel ensemble. Mr. Jones était peiné de ce que Mme. Jones n'était pas comme lui aussi decidée de partir et vu l'insuccès dans la vente de mon brevet, je décidai de rentrer seul en France, et vendredi soir, la veille de sa mort, je lui demandais encore de me donner mon argent car je désirai profiter du change. Mr. Jones me pria d'attendre une dizaine de jours et qu'il serait en mesure de le faire. Or, Mr. Jones fait porter assez souvent de l'argent en banque, et samedi encore l'employé partit à Quings-

town (Kingstown ?) en porter. En moi-même je fis cette remarque et me demandais pourquoi il me faisait ainsi attendre 10 à 15 jours de plus.

Je dis que Mme. Jones est inconsciente. C'est pour elle qu'on a commis ce crime. Malgré que parfois elle a souffert de manque d'affection et de la bestialité provoquée par la jalousie de Mr. Jones, elle ne désirait aucun mal pour lui, et jamais, en ma présence aucune parole de haine n'a été proférée par elle. Malgré aussi que Mme. Jones ait écrit une lettre à son mari (lettre que je ne connais pas, mais que l'amant de Mme. Jones a ou a eue entre les mains) et malgré aussi que Mme. Jones ait remis à la suite de cette lettre sa bague de mariage à Mr. Jones, bague qu'elle a reprise ensuite Mme. Jones ne m'a jamais dit aucune parole de haine contre son mari. Elle en est totalement incapable.

C'est une femme très douce et très impressionable et sur qui certaines personnes exercent une influence néfaste. Elle est l'instrument inconscient de malheur qui la frappe, elle et ses chers enfants.

Pourquoi et dans quel but, aurais-je commis cet horrible forfait ?

Je ne suis pas un alcoholique.

Ce n'est pas, comme on le suppose peut-être, par jalousie puisque Mme. Jones n'avait pour moi aucune affection depuis quelque temps. Ce n'est pas non plus par intérêt, Mme. Jones est dans une situation très difficile que je n'ignorais pas.

Et en admettant comme on le suppose, et que j'aurais été jaloux, ce n'est pas de lui, ni contre lui, que j'aurais eu un grief de vengeance. C'est contre ses amis que j'aurais froissés et eliminés mais non supprimés comme on a supprimé Mr. Jones.

Pour moi, c'est une incommensurable fatalité de me trouver ici en ce moment et mon amitié et mon affection que j'avais pour Mr. Jones se change en colère et je hais Mr. Jones de ne pas m'avoir rendu mon argent avant.

Peut-être aussi que mon absence n'aurait plus gêné et le crime n'aurait pas été commis.

Je reproche à Mme. Jones de ne pas m'avoir laissé partir quand à plusieurs reprises je lui avais fait part de ma douleur de ce qu'elle m'avait retiré son amitié. Toujours Mme. Jones m'a dit (Vous, partir, jamais !).

Que l'ombre de mon cher Jones se lève et crie bien haut mon innocence.

Lui seul sait que je ne suis pas coupable.

Qu'il dise bien à Mme. Jones que ce n'est pas moi et Mme. Jones elle-même, malgré sa colère injustifiée sait bien que j'aimais trop Mr. Jones pour qu'elle m'accuse avec une insistence terrible.

Je la pardonne car ce n'est pas elle qui m'accuse.

Le soir 18 h.

Il y a environ une quinzaine de jours le monsieur qui est venu hier accompagner la servante au commissariat vint avec un autre employé comme toujours. Dans le petit salon au rez de chaussée, il y avait cinq ou 6 personnes dont Mr. Jones. Moi j'étais assis dans le fauteuil qui se trouve devant le sécrétaire. Mme. Jones dans le fauteuil d'en face. A 2

mètres de Mme. Jones, la personne en question assise sur une chaise, et 3 ou 4 personnes sur le canapé. Mr. Jones était a côté de moi et causait avec les autres personnes. De ma place, j'avais donc Mme. Jones et ce Monsieur bien en face. Que signifiait ce regard de Mme. Jones et lui et qui dura presque une minute? Les yeux bien fixes et sans clignoter, cette scène fut remarquée par Mr. Jones et par d'autres sans doute. Le Monsieur eut dans l'intervalle un regard rapide vers Mr. Jones.

Je me garderai bien d'accuser ce Monsieur mais cela, maintenant, me revient et me parait étrange, j'en fis la remarque à Mme. Jones qui n'a jamais pu me dire la signification de ce regard prolongé et exagéré.

Vous pouvez dire, Messieurs, que d'autres personnes vous l'ont dit, et Mme. Jones ne niera pas.

C'était après que Madame Jones eût comparu au tribunal avec ses créanciers.

Ce même jour, Mr. et Mme. Jones montèrent au grand salon avec ce Monsieur.

J'estime que ce Monsieur, qui éprouve le besoin de déposer contre moi ou faire des demarches, et qui a déclaré son amour pour Mme. Jones pourrait savoir quelquechose.

Exhibit No. 5.

Ce 5/7.

STATEMENT BY PRISONER, 5TH APRIL, 1914.

J'ai déjà dit que Mr. Jones m'avait déclaré que *jamais* George, le garçon de bar, ne quitterait Blue Anchor, devait-il même gagner 5 livres par jour ailleurs, Pourquoi?

Je pense que le second acte du drame sera la disparition de la femme de Georges aussi mystèrieusement et aussi tragiquement que Mr. Jones. Ou bien, cette femme devra continuer à accepter le menage à 3, ce qui n'a pas l'air de lui plaire puisqu'elle veut quitter Blue Anchor et son mari.

Georges a un ascendant incontestable et considérable sur cette malheureuse femme sans défense (Mme. Jones). Mme. Jones remet l'argent au garçon et celui-ci le porte dans sa chambre *à lui*. Cela ne se voit jamais.

Le 2 Avril Mme. Jones que je priais sans me faire comprendre de chercher le reçu de l'argent preté à son mari (ce qu'elle n'a fait encore et qui pour moi est très important). Mme. Jones, dis-je, manifesta la première de faire appel à Mr. Schulte (interprète) et elle même redigea le télégramme devant une dame qui alla le porter à la poste.

Mr. Schulte vint avant hier. Nous étions dans ma chambre; à 2 reprises je priai la bonne de dire à Mme. Jones de venir.

Qui donne ordre à cette femme très obéissante de ne pas obéir? Georges.

Cinq minutes se passèrent en causerie sans importance et Mme. Jones decendit sous pretexte que son oncle était là et qu'elle allait remonter de suite.

Appendix II.

Près d'une heure se passa, Moi impatient, je descendais à l'office et voyais Mme. Jones avec les 2 ou 3 servantes qui ont reçu une consigne sévère.

Qui interdit à Mme. Jones de remonter avec l'interprète et moi? Georges.

Je remontais dans ma chambre retrouver Mr. Schulte et attendîmes encore ¾ d'heure, je priais alors Mr. Schulte d'aller dire à Mme. Jones, toujours dans la même cuisine, qu'elle l'avait derangé inutilement, et qu'il allait repartir. Et de fait, il se fit payer son déplacement et partit.

10 fois, 20 fois, je prie la bonne de dire à Mme. Jones que j'ai à m'expliquer au sujet de ce qui me préoccupe le plus, mon argent, le reçu; jamais les commissions ne sont faites. C'est toujours Georges qui intercepte et defend de le dire à Mme. Jones.

Hier, vers 15 h., de retour de Londres, je remets à une servante, 2 cartes postales sans importance qu'elle m'avait adressées de Lourdes. Je prie la bonne de les remettre de suite à Mme. Jones. Que fait la servante? Elle s'empresse de les remettre a Georges qui les déchiffre dans la salle à manger juste au moment ou j'entrais, je lui fis remarquer que c'était à Mme. Jones qu'il aurait fallu les remettre et non à lui. Reponse : il les mit dans sa poche. La bonne était présente.

Pourquoi la servante remet-elle tout ce qui concerne Mme. Jones à Georges, plutôt qu'à sa maitresse?

Qui intercepte et supprime la correspondence de Mme. Jones, même lorsque Mme. Jones était là? Georges.

1 lettre et une carte adressées à Mme. Jones ont disparu du courrier, jamais Mme. Jones ne les a eues et n'a manifesté. Elle, si vive, aucune colère, car elle craint et elle sait!

Je désirerais ardemment que l'on veuille bien prier Mme. Jones de venir afin de nous expliquer une bonne fois sur ce qu'elle pretend avoir payé pour moi et la prier de vouloir bien se décider à faire des recherches et lui donner le signalement de la personne à qui Mr. Jones prêta l'argent. Car il est inadmissible que Mme. Jones ne la connaisse pas.

Je suis seul et sans défense contre tous. On a tenu à profiter de ma présence pour se débarasser d'un homme qui ne demandait qu'à vivre et faire peser sur moi, étranger, que personne ne regarde plus, et que tout le monde accuse, tout le poids de cet abominable et monstreux crime.

Je ne comprends malheureusement pas l'anglais, mais jai compris il y a longtemps ce qui se passe dans cette maison de rendez-vous, où des femmes en permanence servent d'appât à quelques hommes ivres de débauche.

Il se passe là dedans des choses que l'on ne sait pas dans les maisons closes, et où la police ferait bien des fois bonne recette.

Et je dirai toujours, même si la fatalité qui jusqu'ici s'acharne après moi, je dirai toujours, partout, devant mes juges, si je dois y aller, que l'assassin, ce lâche criminel, est encore à Blue Anchor. Et cette affreuse personne a un ou une complice.

Je suis affirmatif sur ce point, à condition que le flacon ait été lavé comme on me l'a demandé à la Police. Si le flacon n'a pas été lavé, pas

de complice car Mr. Jones en crachant l'eau a pu en mettre dans le flacon qui était sur la table.

Mais si ce flacon que je n'ai eu que quelques secondes dans mes mains devant la femme et sans bouger du devant du tiroir où etait enfermé ce flacon et que j'ai remis dans ce tiroir, toujours la femme présente, et ce flacon a été lavé avant ou après que je l'ai vu et touche, il y a alors une complice ou un complice car tout le monde, même des gens qui n'ont rien à faire là dedans, entrent toujours dans cet office.

Exhibit No. 6.

Statement by Prisoner, 10th April, 1924.

Ce que j'ai déjà dit et que je complète par ce qui suit, doit suffisamment faire comprendre que je suis absolument étranger dans cet odieux crime, et faire écarter le moindre soupçon à mon égard.

J'affirme, et je veux prouver que si j'avais eu une intention criminelle vis-a-vis de Mr. Jones, j'avais, moi, des moyens et des occasions que le misérable n'avait pas, et dont il n'aurait pas manqué d'utiliser et de profiter s'il eut été à ma place.

1°. A deux reprises, j'ai monté Mr. Jones, ivre-mort, sur mes bras, et l'ai laissé devant la porte de sa chambre où la malheureuse Mme. Jones le prenait et le faisait se coucher.

Un soir, notamment, Mr. Jones arrivait de Quingstown avec 3 habitués de la maison. Mr. Jones etait absolument ivre mais eut assez d'idée pour dire qu'il y avait 2 femmes dans la maison. C'est alors (et Mr. Jones m'en garda rancune!) que j'imposai le respect pour Mme. Jones car je compris qu'il disait qu'ils étaient 3 et qu'il n'y avait que 2 femmes. Alors, un des trois, que depuis j'ai signalé à Mr. et Mme. Jones, dit ceci : Oh, mais il y a Mistress Jones! Et ce fut à mon regard indigne qu'ils comprirent que la chose était impossible. Monsieur Jones deux ou 3 jours après m'écrivait une lettre me disant que je m'occupais des choses qui ne me regardaient pas. Je compris!

Et lorsque tous trois eurent assouvi leur vice sur ces 2 femmes et qu'ils furent repartis, que Mr. Jones aprés avoir encore vidé quelques verres de Wisky qu'il fut totalment incapable à fermer les portes et de monter les escaliers. Encore une fois, je le prenais sur mes bras et le montait à sa chambre.

Quoi de plus facile, pour moi, si j'avais eu quelque intention de faire mal à Mr. Jones, et de me débarraser d'un homme dans l'état où il se trouvait?

Il m'était très facile de prendre une bouteille de wisky et lui en faire absorber le contenu sans l'y obliger car il ne demandait qu'à boire encore, et, sans aucun poison, sans lui faire aucun mal, sans rien, il était mort étouffé par l'alcohol. C'eut été plus humain j'estime que l'emploi de tout corrosif qui fait horriblement souffrir et surtout n'eut pas été compromettant pour moi.

20 fois, j'aurais eu l'occasion de le faire, car je restais seul avec lui jusqu'à 2 et 3 heures du matin.

2°. Je n'ignorais pas qu'il avait amené ses 2 autos à Londres (ou ailleurs) pour la vente (ces 2 voitures je les ai vues partir avec des plaques-chiffres prêtées par des amis), j'aurais attendu qu'il réalisât ces affaires.

3°. J'aurai attendu aussi qu'il vendit son hotel comme il l'avait decidé (on lui offrait 3000 livres).

4°. Et aussi j'aurai attendu qu'il se fit rendre plus de 600 livres qu'il a prêtées et qu'en raison de notre prochain depart pour la France, il allait en demander le remboursement.

J'aurais patiemment et sûrement attendu tout cela et n'aurais eu aucune raison de précipiter les événements de façon si traqique et agir brutalement et lâchement comme on l'a fait. C'eut été l'ceuvre d'un fou si j'avais agi ainsi.

J'avais l'estime et la confiance de Mr. et Mme. Jones je les aimais comme on aime un frère et une soeur, puisque il était décidé que nous nous associerions et vivrions ensemble. Les affaires réalisés Mr. Jones devait avoir à peu près ceci :—

Vente de l'Hotel, - - -	3000 livres.	
Prêt Dr de Brooklands, - - -	500	
a M.M., - - - -	100	
Vente 2 autos, - - - -	200	?
Dépôt en Banque, - - -	500	
	4300	

Ceci, pour vous démontrer que je n'ignorais rien des affaires de Mr. Jones, à qui tous deux, avec Mme. Jones, ils m'avaient entretenu à plusieurs reprises.

De par le décès de Mr. Jones, Mme. Jones n'a rien de tout cela.

Exhibit No. 7.

STATEMENT BY PRISONER ON ARREST, 19TH APRIL, 1924.

In pencil.

10.30 p.m. 19.4.24.

In typewriting.

On the 29th day of March at the Parish of Byfleet in the County of Surrey, did feloniously, wilfully and of his malice aforethought did kill and murder one, Alfred George Poynter Jones, by administering a certain poison, to wit, Strychnine, against the Peace, etc. etc.

In pencil.

No reply.

I expected it.

All the suspicions have been against me.

I assure you that on the tomb of my mother I am innocent, and that I will make known to-morrow he who administered the poison.

He who had the poison bought, since the 1st day all suspicions is against me, and if I said nothing it was that I had the firm conviction

that the Police would have discovered the culprit, but as I am now accused to-morrow without fail I will tell the truth. I beg of you & you will see to-morrow, do not put me in prison if you can help it. I prefer to die, you will see I am not guilty.

Exhibit No. 8.

EXTRACT FROM SALES OF POISONS BOOK.

Date.	Name of Purchaser.	Name and Quantity of Poison sold.	Purpose for which it is required.	Signature of Purchaser.
1924. Mar. 1.	Mr. Wanker, 60 Hotel Russell.	Hyd. Perchlor 20 gm. Strych. Hydrochlor. ·12 gm.	Wireless Experiments.	J. Wanker.

Exhibit No. 13.

POSTCARD FROM MRS. JONES TO PRISONER.

Postmarks.
Lourdes,
16.1.24.

Biarritz,
16.1.24.
Pyrenees.

J. Pierre Vaquier, Esq.,
Victoria Hotel,
Biarritz,
France.

16/1/24.

Dear Friend,
Have arrived safely, am going to Pau tomorrow morning. On my arrival I found a telegrame awaiting me from home. Regards.
(Sgd.) M. JONES.

Exhibit No. 14.

POSTCARD FROM MRS. JONES TO PRISONER.

Postmark.
Pau.
20-30.
17.1.24.
Basses Pyrenees.

17/1/24.

Dear Friend,
I thank you for your letter & if possible will return to Biarritz unless something unforseen turns up.
Kind regards.
(Sgd.) MABEL JONES.

Appendix II.

Exhibit No. 15.

HOTEL BILL AT HOTEL BAYONNE, BIARRITZ.

Monsieur Vaquier.

Arrivé le 28 Janvier 1924.

Registre du Commerce
Bayonne No. 4 713.

Addition du 30 Jan. 24.

Janvier	28.	2 dîners	24
		1 Beaune	14
		Chambre	18
	29.	2 p. déjeuners	6
		2 déjeuners	24
		1 Real Graves	12
		2 Cafés	3
		2 dîners	24
		1 Real Médoc	12
		2 cafés tilleul	3
		Chambre	18
	30.	2 p. déjeuners	6
		2 déjeuners	24
		2 Dubonnet	6
		1 Beaune '17	14
		2 dîners	24
		1 Real Médoc	12
		Chambre	18
			262
Janvier	31.	2 p. déjeuners	6
		2 déjeuners	24
		1 Beaune '17	14
		2 dîners	24
		1 Real Médoc	12
		Chambre	18
		2 Cafés	3
Fev.	1.	2 petits déjeuners	6
		2 déjeuners	24
		1 Beaune	14
		2 Cafés	3
		2 dîners	24
		Supplément diner app.	4
		1 Real Médoc	12
		Chambre	18
		2 Cafés	3
		2 Bénédictines	7
			216
		Pourboires 10 per cent.	21.60

Jean Pierre Vaquier.

Fev.	2.	2 petits déjeuners - - - -	6
		2 déjeuners - - - - -	24
		1 Beaune - - - - -	14
		2 Cafés - - - - -	5
		3 Martell - - - - -	7.50
		2 Dubonnets - - - -	5
		½ Siphon - - - - -	1
		Chambre - - - - -	18
		2 dîners - - - - -	24
		1 Real Médoc - - - -	12
	3.	2 petits déjeuners - - - -	6
		2 déjeuners - - - - -	24
		2 Dubonnets - - - -	5
		1 Beaune - - - - -	14
		Bagages - - - - -	2
		2 dîners - - - - -	24
		1 Beaune - - - - -	14
		Chambre - - - - -	18
	4.	Omnibus départ - - - -	5
		2 petits déjeuners - - - -	6
		2 déjeuners - - - - -	24
		1 Beaune - - - - -	14
		Taxe de séjour - - - -	16.80
			299.30
		Pourboires - - -	30
			329.30

Exhibit No. 16.

TELEGRAM FROM PRISONER TO MRS. JONES, 12TH FEBRUARY, 1924.

Southampton Row—sent 2-32 p.m.

To Mrs. Jones,
Blue Anchor Hotel, Byfleet.

Arrived from Biarritz on business shall be very pleased to see you Hotel Russell & to meet Mr. Jones perhaps you will inform me when convenient.

From : VAQUIER.

Exhibit No. 17.

EXTRACT FROM VISITORS' BOOK, BLUE ANCHOR HOTEL, BYFLEET.

Date of Arrival.	Full Name.	Permanent Address.	Business Address.	Nationality.	Date of Departure.
14 . 2 . 24.	P. Vaquier.	Paris.	Londres.	Francais.	—

Appendix II.

Exhibit No. 18.

CHEQUE DRAWN BY A. JONES.

No. A 27814. 3/12/23.

To the

National Provincial and Union Bank of England Limited
Kingston on Thames
39 Market Place (Stamp 2d.)

Pay Bearer or Order

Fourteen pounds only.

(Sgd.) A. JONES.

£14 : 0 : 0.

Crossed :—
& Co.

Rubber Stamps : Barclays Bank Ltd.
Bloomsbury Branch
A/C Hotel Russell
PAID
19 Feb. 1924.

Endorsed :—M. JONES.

Exhibit No. 19.

ADVERTISEMENT BY DR. SCHULTE.

High Class Interpreter-Guide-Companion-Courrier (or Secretary)
For LONDON or TRAVEL ABROAD
Gentleman by birth, of good family
Aged 52, Height 6 feet 4 inches.
Commercial University Education.
Used to best Society.
Linguist in six Languages.

SPANISH, ITALIAN, FRENCH, GERMAN, ENGLISH AND DUTCH.

Knows London thoroughly—his residence for 33 years; also the Provinces and whole of Europe. Has travelled during ten years ALL OVER THE WORLD (except West Africa) on pleasure and business (export and newspapers) and tourist business. Knows South and North America specially well.

Belgian by birth. Highest References.

D. SCHULTE,
Erin House,
68, Torrington Square, 68
London, W.C.1.

(Photo.)

In pencil
Mercredi
attendre
11h a 11½

Jean Pierre Vaquier.

Written in Pencil on back.

(2) Why not wait a little while until my business is settled.
Pourquoi ne pas attendre un peu jusqu'à ce que mes affaires soient réglées.
(3) To find pretext for your husband.
(4) Purchase of license for England solely 60,000 schilings.
(5) Meeting of Syndicate of the Porkshop, Tuesday 10th.

President.

M
6. Whos
Who's Master you or I?
Maitre vous ou moi.

Exhibit No. 20.

PENCIL NOTE IN PRISONER'S HANDWRITING.

Madame Jones, your gesture of to burn my photographie to a ave meaning whom you to accuse me of the misfortune who me to crush. To make attention you, whom through of falsehood and for to make happy of other to make to make to go in prison.

Exhibit No. 21.

NOTE BY PRISONER TO MRS. JONES.

Blue Anchor Hotel,
Byfleet,
Surrey.

Madame Jones.

Your solicitor to come here to day morning love him much
Adieu for ever

Exhibit No. 24.

EXTRACT FROM RUSSELL HOTEL REGISTER, 9TH FEBRUARY, 1924.

Name in Full.	Nationality.	Permanent Address.	Nos.	Rooms Allotted. Adults.	Prices.
P. Vacquier.	Francais.	Bordeaux.	629	1	£ per week.

Appendix II.

Exhibit No. 25.

ALIENS' REGISTRATION FORM.

Room 629 Hotel Russell, London

1. Surname,
Nom, P. Vaquier.

2. Christian Names,
Prénoms,

3. Nationality,
Nationalité, Francais.

4. Birthplace,
Lieu de Naissance,

5. Year of Birth,
Année de Naissance, 1879.

6. Sex,
Sexe,

7. Permanent address (a) residence
Adresse permanente
(b) Business
Adresse commerciale

8. Trade or Occupation
Profession, occupation

9. Whether served in any Army, Navy or Police Force
Avez vous servi dans l'Armée la Marine ou la Police?
If so, state what Army, Navy or Police Force
Quelle Armée, quelle Marine, quelle Police?

10. Arrived here from (give last address in full) 81 Bd. Victor Emmanuell
Dernière adresse Bordeaux
Signature of person to whom above particulars relate
Signature de la personne indiqué ci-dessus
Date of signing Feb. 9 1924.
Date de la signature
P. Vaquier

11. Date of departure
Date de départ

12. New Address or Destination
Nouveau lieu de destination et adresse

Le 16/2/24

Signature : P. VAQUIER.

Exhibit No. 26.

Prisoner's Bill at Hotel Russell

Roon 629.

P. Vaquier, Esq.,
Hotel Russell,
Russell Square, London, W.C.1.

£3 weekly.

1924. February.	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Brought forward,	...	1 4 6	2 11 9	3 19 6	6 1 8	7 15 2	8 19 2	9 8 2
Apartments, - - -	0 8 6	0 8 6	0 8 6	0 8 6	0 8 6	0 8 6	0 9 0	...
Breakfast, - - -	...	0 4 6	...	...	0 2 6	0 5 0	...	...
Luncheon, - - -	...	...	0 5 0	0 5 0	...	0 5 0		
Dinner, - - - -	0 9 0	0 8 3	0 5 9	0 17 0	0 17 0	...		
Tea, Coffee, Milk, etc., -	...	0 0 6	...	...	...	...		
Wines, - - - -	0 5 6	0 5 6	0 8 6	0 11 0	0 5 6	0 5 6		
Minerals, - - - -	0 1 6	...	...	...	...	...		
Telephone Calls, - -	...	...	...	0 0 8	...	...		
Total, - -	£1 4 6	£2 11 9	£3 19 6	£6 1 8	£7 15 2	£8 19 2	£9 8 2	£9 8 2

Hotel Russell,
London, 16 . 4 . 1924
70612. (Stamp 2d.)

Received from
P. Vaquier, Esq.,
Room 629.
A. F. L.
£9 . 8 . 2.

Appendix II.

Exhibit No. 27.

EXTRACT FROM HOTEL RUSSELL REGISTER, 3RD MARCH, 1924.

Name in Full.	Nationality.	Permanent Address.	Rooms Allotted. Nos.	Adults.	Price.
Mr. and Mrs. J. P. Jones.	British.	Heaton Moor, Stockport.	153	2	LA/

Exhibit No. 28.

PRISONER'S BILL AT HOTEL RUSSELL, 3RD MARCH, 1924.

Room 549.

P. Vaquier Esq.,
Hotel Russell,
Russell Square,
London W.C.1.

March, 1924		3	4
	Brought forward		£1 12 9
Apartments	£0 15 0		
Dinner	0 10 3		
Wines	0 7 6		1 12 9
	£1 12 9		£1 12 9

Exhibit No. 29.

TRANSLATION OF EXHIBIT No. 4.

Blue Anchor Hotel,
Byfleet, Surrey.

By the attitude of the staff of the house and my interrogation of yesterday I understand at last that I am accused of causing the death of Mr. Jones. This man, to whom I was attached, and whom I loved like a brother, is the victim of a coward, jealous of my presence here.

Mr. Jones was not in the least jealous of me, and for a very good reason.

But others found my presence embarrassing. I insisted on Mr. and Mrs. Jones being treated with respect, and this did not please the regular clients of this house of pleasure.

I say that if the poison which killed Mr. Jones was not put in his glass by the criminal himself (involuntary criminal, perhaps) it was put

there by a servant in the pay of this cowardly suitor with the object, according to me, a foreigner, to have me accused of this horrible tragedy.

I was not jealous of Mr. Jones. I had no right to be, for no intimate relations existed between myself and Mrs. Jones here, and I can say that if ever so cowardly and criminal an idea could have been born in my brain it would have been much easier for me to rid myself of Mr. Jones in the evening when no one was present, and when Mr. Jones was blind drunk.

I should never have poured poison into a bottle that was at every one's disposal with the risk of killing any one.

For eight days I had only been wanting one thing, to go away again with my money, for Mr. Jones, whom I had requested to give me back my little fortune, told me that my presence at the Blue Anchor drove away the regular clients, and that I interfered a little too much with matters that did not concern me (alluding to the respect I insisted on being shown Mrs. Jones).

Once more I say that the poison was introduced Saturday between eleven o'clock at night, at which hour I went to bed, and Sunday morning seven o'clock, at which hour I came down to the kitchen. This coward, if he committed this crime so as to obtain the estate of Mr. and Mrs. Jones, was certainly ignorant of the fact that the hotel is in the name of Mr. Jones, that Mrs. Jones is a bankrupt, and that everything, in the event of Mr. Jones's death, was to pass, one-half to Mrs. Jones and one-half to the children. But Mrs. Jones had still liabilities of £2000, and the creditors have a claim on what comes to Mrs. Jones. This means that Mrs. Jones possesses nothing. If lucre guided the hand of this cowardly assassin, he made a mistake, or else, to get rid of two men just to satisfy his passion and to have me accused of a crime, that I should not commit even if quite mad. I have never told Mr. Jones of a great love for Mrs. Jones as others have taken the liberty of doing. (Mrs. Jones had written this to me, but she insisted that I should return to her some compromising friendly things that she had written to me.)

It is among these suitors that it is possible to find the cowardly assassin who makes the suspicion of having committed the most terrible and the most cowardly murder ever perpetrated, hover over an honest man.

This morning the doors are locked but the windows open, unusual precautions, and quite unnecessary for me, for a man who has nothing to reproach himself with does not try to run away.

If Mrs. Jones would speak, she alone can perhaps know him, who has every interest to get rid of me and Mr. Jones.

The attitude of Mrs. Jones towards me is inexplicable. Yesterday morning, coming up the stairs and whilst I was in the kitchen, Mrs. Jones, who was accompanied, shook her fist at me, saying words that I do not understand. The gesture is significant, it is accusing. In the evening Mrs. Jones agrees to have a drink with me and the detectives, she invites me to come and chat in the parlour, and comes to dine with me and her son.

About 16 o'clock (4 p.m.) she came into the dining-room with several persons and gave me to understand that I was to leave the house, saying

to me "Baggages." This hurt me very much, and I went for a walk with the dog. In the evening I returned to my room and packed my bag, carried it down, and asked the waiter (potman) to phone for a taxi.

Coming down I met the detectives, who asked me to remain, and Mrs. Jones then came to tell me, in the presence of the detectives, that she *never* told me to leave. Mrs. Jones denied having told me that, no doubt on the advice of her lover : this would suggest that I was taking to flight. It was the same evening that I accompanied Mrs. Jones, against her wish, to her lawyer (the day or two days before the hearing at the Court at Kingston), that Mrs. Jones, whom I threatened to leave even at Waterloo Station unless I went with her to her lawyer, said to me in the Waterloo subway, that in view of my jealousy all friendship between us was at an end, that all was over, and that I might return to Byfleet and to France. I decided then to accompany Mrs. Jones and, until we arrived at the house of the lawyer, we did not say a single word. We went to have tea with her lover at 6 o'clock and returned to Byfleet. It was this solicitor's clerk who accompanied a servant to the police station yesterday. It was the same gentleman who told Mr. Jones that he madly loved his wife. Stated by Mr. Jones and also by Mrs. Jones to me. Mrs. Jones had written me this, but this paper, like the others, disappeared into the fire. The wife of the waiter (potman) begged me one day in the kitchen, before the other woman, to get her a good situation in Biarritz. On my consenting, I understood that this woman was satisfied. In the evening, about midnight, I told Mr. Jones of it, and expressed my astonishment at the woman's leaving her husband. Mr. Jones told me that George would never leave the Blue Anchor, even if he earned £5 a day in France, and would say no more, notwithstanding my insistence. I understood!

What is the motive that makes Mrs. Jones accuse me of the death of her husband? Under what impulse is she acting? Can she say that I have ever uttered a threat against her husband, whom I was very fond of, as he was very kind-hearted, and with whom I had decided to go to France. Mr. Jones was enthusiastic about selling the hotel and coming to St. Jean de Luz to run a hotel together. Mr. Jones was hurt that Mrs. Jones was not as decided about leaving as he was, and in view of the failure of the sale of my patent, I decided to return to France alone, and Friday evening, the evening before his death, I again asked him to give me my money, as I wished to take advantage of the rate of exchange. Mr. Jones asked me to wait about ten days, and that he then would be able to do so. Now Mr. Jones often has money carried to the bank, and again Saturday, the employee went to Kingstown with some; I myself noticed it, and wondered why then he made me wait ten or fifteen days more. I say that Mrs. Jones is thoughtless. It is for her that the crime has been committed. Notwithstanding that she sometimes suffered from the want of affection and bestiality caused by the jealousy of Mr. Jones, she did not wish him any harm. And never in my presence has she uttered any word of hatred. Notwithstanding also that Mrs. Jones wrote a letter to her husband (which letter I did not see, but which Mrs. Jones's lover has had or has in his possession), and notwithstanding also that Mrs. Jones,

following upon that letter, returned her wedding ring to Mr. Jones, which ring she took back later, Mrs. Jones never uttered a word of hatred to me against her husband. She is totally incapable of it.

She is a very kind and impressionable woman, over whom certain persons have a bad influence. She is the unconscious instrument of the misfortune which has befallen her, she and her dear children.

Why and with what object should I have committed this horrible crime? I am not a drunkard!

It is not as one may perhaps suppose, out of jealousy because Mrs. Jones had no longer any affection for me for some time. It is not either for pecuniary reasons—Mrs. Jones was in great difficulties—I was well aware of this, even assuming, as is thought, that I was jealous, it was not of him or against him that I should have a reason for revenge. It is against his friends whom I should have slighted and eliminated, not removed as Mr. Jones has been removed. For me it is an immeasurable misfortune to find myself here at this moment, and my friendship and affection that I had for Mr. Jones is changed to wrath, and I hate Mr. Jones for not having given me back my money before. Perhaps if I had left and not been in the way any longer, the crime would not have been committed; I reproach Mrs. Jones with not having let me leave when I several times informed her of my pain at her having withdrawn her friendship. Always Mrs. Jones said to me: you—leave, never (Vous partez jamais). Let the spirit of my dear Jones arise and loudly proclaim my innocence. He alone knows that I am not guilty. Let him tell Mrs. Jones that it is not I, and Mrs. Jones herself, notwithstanding her unjustified anger, is well aware that I loved Mr. Jones too much for her to accuse me with such terrible insistence.

I forgive her, for it is not she who accuses me.

Evening, 18 o'clock (6 p.m.)

About a fortnight ago the gentleman who yesterday accompanied the servant to the police station came with another employee as always. In the small parlour on the ground floor there were five or six persons, amongst whom was Mr. Jones; I was sitting in the armchair which is in front of the writing desk. Mrs. Jones was in the armchair opposite, 2 metres from Mrs. Jones, the persons in question sitting on a chair, and three or four persons on the sofa. Mr. Jones was next to me and chatted with the other people. From my position I had therefore Mrs. Jones and this gentleman in full view. What did the look signify that Mrs. Jones and he exchanged and which lasted almost a minute? The eyes were fixed and wide open without winking; this scene was noticed by Mr. Jones and also no doubt by others. The gentleman in the interval threw a rapid glance towards Mr. Jones.

Far be it from me to accuse this gentleman, but this now comes back to me and seems strange to me. I remarked as much to Mrs. Jones, who was never able to tell me the meaning of that long and exaggerated stare.

You can say, gentlemen, that other person told you about it, and Mrs. Jones will not deny it.

Appendix II.

It was after Mrs. Jones had appeared at Court with her creditors.

That same day Mr. and Mrs. Jones went upstairs to the drawing-room with this gentleman.

I consider that this gentleman, who felt it necessary to make a statement against me or to undertake certain steps against me, and who had declared his love for Mrs. Jones, may know something.

Exhibit No. 30.

Translation of Exhibit No. 5.

I have already stated that Mr. Jones had informed me that George the potman would never leave the Blue Anchor, even should he make £5 a day elsewhere. Why?

I think that the second act of the drama will be the disappearance of the wife of George, as mysteriously and also as tragically as Mr. Jones. Or else, this woman will have to continue to share her husband with some one else, which does not seem to please her since she wishes to leave the Blue Anchor and her husband.

George has an incontestable and considerable ascendancy over that unhappy, defenceless woman (Mrs. Jones). Mrs. Jones gives the money to the potman, and he takes it to his room. This is never seen.

On the 2nd April, Mrs. Jones, whom I was asking, without getting her to understand, to look for the receipt for the money lent to her husband (which she has not yet done, and which is very important to me), Mrs. Jones, I say, was the first to desire to call in Mr. Schulte (interpreter), and she herself wrote out the telegram before a lady, who carried it to the post office.

Mr. Schulte came the day before yesterday. We were in my room, and three times I told the servant to tell Mrs. Jones to come.

Who gave the order to this very obedient woman not to obey? George.

Five minutes were passed in unimportant chatting, and Mrs. Jones went down on the pretext that her uncle was there and that she was coming back at once.

Nearly an hour passed; I was impatient, and went down to the kitchen and saw Mrs. Jones with two or three servants who had received very strict orders.

Who forbade Madam Jones to come upstairs again to the interpreter and myself? George.

I returned to my room to Mr. Schulte, and we waited another three-quarters of an hour. I then asked Mr. Schulte to go and tell Mrs. Jones, still in the same kitchen, that she had sent for him needlessly and that he was going back. And in fact he obtained the payment for his journey and went.

Ten times, twenty times, I asked the servant to tell Mrs. Jones that I desired to explain myself to her on the subject of what worried me most,

my money, the receipt; my messages are never given to her. It is always George who intercepts them and forbids that Mrs. Jones should be told.

Yesterday about 4 p.m., returning from London, I gave one of the servants two postcards of no importance that she had sent to me to Lourdes. I requested the servant to hand them at once to Mrs. Jones.

What did the servant do? She hurried and gave them to George, who read them in the dining-room just as I entered; I observed to him that they were to have been given to Mrs. Jones and not to him. In reply he put them in his pocket; the servant was present. Why did the servant give everything concerning Mrs. Jones to George, rather than to her mistress?

Who intercepts and suppresses Mrs. Jones's correspondence, even when Mrs. Jones was there? George.

One letter and one postcard addressed to Mrs. Jones disappeared from the correspondence. Mrs. Jones never received them, and says nothing. She so quick-tempered, no outburst of temper, for she fears and she knows.

I desire ardently that Mrs. Jones should be asked to come so that we might have an explanation once and for all regarding what she pretends to have paid for me and to ask of her that she will decide to make investigations and to give to her the description of the person to whom Mr. Jones lent the money. It is inadmissible that Mrs. Jones does not know this person.

I am alone and defenceless against every one, advantage has been taken of my presence here to get rid of a man who only wished to live and to blame on to me, a foreigner, whom no one considers any longer and whom every one accuses, all the weight of this abominable and monstrous crime.

I unfortunately do not understand English, but I have understood for a long time what is taking place in this house of assignation where women, permanently there, were used to attract men drunken with desire. Things happened in there that are unknown in brothels, and the police would often make good hauls there. And I will always say even if misfortune follows me, as it has so far done, I will always say everywhere, before my judges, if I am to go before them, that the assassin, this cowardly criminal, is still at the Blue Anchor, and this awful person has an accomplice, male or female.

I am firm on this point, on the condition that the bottle was washed, as I have been asked at the police station. If the bottle was not washed, there is no accomplice, for Mr. Jones spitting out the water could have introduced some into the bottle which was on the table.

But if this bottle, which I only had in my hands a few seconds in front of the woman and without moving away from in front of the drawer where the bottle was put away and which I replaced in this drawer still in the presence of the woman, and this bottle was washed before or after I saw and touch it, then there is an accomplice, male or female, for everybody, even people who have no business in there, always go into this kitchen.

Appendix II.

Exhibit No. 31.

Translation of Exhibit No. 6.

That which I have already said, and which I complete by what follows, should make it sufficiently clear that I am an absolute stranger to this odious crime, and set aside the slightest suspicion against me.

I affirm, and I will prove that if I had had any criminal intention regarding Mr. Jones, I had means and opportunities that the scoundrel had not, and of which he would not have failed to take advantage if he had been in my place.

1. Twice I carried Mr. Jones dead drunk upstairs in my arms and I left him before the door of his room, where the unhappy Mrs. Jones took him and put him to bed.

One evening especially, Mr. Jones arrived from Kingston with three regular clients of the house; Mr. Jones was quite drunk, but was sufficiently lucid to say that there were two women in the house. It was then (and Mr. Jones bore me malice for this) that I insisted on Mrs. Jones being treated with respect, for I understood that they said that there were three of them and that there were only two women. Then one of the three, whom since then I have indicated to Mrs. Jones and Mr. Jones, said this: "Oh, but there is Mrs. Jones," and it was owing to my indignant look that they understood that the thing was impossible. Mr. Jones two or three days after wrote me a letter saying that I mixed myself in matters that did not concern me. I understood.

And when all three had satisfied their vice on these two women and left, it was then Mr. Jones, after having emptied two more glasses of whisky, was completely incapable of closing the doors and going upstairs. Once more I took him in my arms and carried him to his room.

What would have been easier for me, if I had had any intention of harming Mr. Jones, to then get rid of a man in the state he was.

It would have been very easy for me to take a bottle of whisky and get him to drink it without forcing him, for he desired nothing better than to continue to drink, and without any poison, without hurting him in any way, without anything, he would have died stifled by the alcohol. It would have been more humane in my estimation than the use of any corrosive that causes horrible suffering, and, above all, would not have been compromising for me.

Twenty times I could have had the opportunity of doing this, for I remained with him until two or three in the morning.

2. I was not unaware that he had taken both his motor cars to London (or elsewhere) to sell them (I saw these two cars go off with number plates lent by friends); I should have waited until he had realised on these.

3. I should have waited also till he had sold his hotel, as he had decided to do. (He had been offered three thousand pounds.)

4. And I should also have waited until he had obtained the return of over £600 that he had lent, and of which, in view of our pending departure for France, he was going to demand the reimbursement.

I should patiently and surely have waited for all that, and should not have had any reason to precipitate events in a manner so tragic, and act brutally and cowardly as was done. It would have been the act of a madman if I had so acted.

I enjoyed the esteem and the confidence of Mr. and Mrs. Jones, I loved them as one does a brother and a sister since it was decided that we should become partners and live together. When the business was realised, Mr. Jones would have had about the following :—

Sale of hotel, - - - - -	£3000	
Loan Dr. de Brocklands, - - -	500	
a M.M.—Xez, - - - - -	100	
Sale of two cars, - - - -	200	?
Bank deposit, - - - -	500	
	£4300	

This is to show you that I knew all Mr. Jones's affairs, because both of them, with Mrs. Jones, had repeatedly talked about them to me.

By the death of Mr. Jones, Mrs. Jones gets nothing of all this.

Exhibit No. 32.

Document Written by Prisoner.

Je dis et j'affirme que Mme. Jones est absolument innocente et aucun doute n'est possible.

Un jour, à la suite d'une scène (je n'ai jamais compris à quel sujet), Mme. Jones s'en fut à sa chambre pour donner libre cours à sa peine. J'allai à la cuisine et demandai aux deux servantes ce qui s'etait passé. Une des deux servantes (la jeune) m'écrivit sur un bout de papier, et sur la table même de la cuisine, et en anglais que je traduisais de suite. (Avec un homme pareil, moi, pas, rester longtemps.)

Le soir, je voyais Mme. Jones toujours dans un profond chagrin, et lui conseillais de ne pas vivre toujours ainsi et de quitter une bonne fois Mr. Jones. Mme. Jones m'écrivit textuellement ceci, et je traduisais "Moi, souffrir toujours, jamais faire du mal, ne quitter Mr. Jones j'ai des enfants."

Une autre fois Mme. Jones était partie en pleurs. Je pensai que dans un moment de désespoir elle aurait été se noyer, j'allai à sa récherche avec une bonne. Elle revint (Mme. Jones) vers 15 h. et comme je lui faisais part de mes craintes, elle me répondit ceci; "Moi me détruire? Jamais. Je pardonne toujours à Mr. Jones parcequ'il a bu. Une femme est faite pour souffrir."

A Biarritz, à l'hotel Victoria, lorsqu'elle recevait une lettre de Mr. Jones, elle etait si heureuse que les larmes perlaient à ses yeux, et lorsqu'elle reçut le telegr. lui disant de rentrer de suite elle etait très heureuse.

Appendix II.

Personne ne peut dire que Mme. Jones n'aimait pas son mari, car toute autre femme n'aurait jamais supporté ce qu'elle a souffert.

Je ne connais pas le passé de Mme. Jones, mais si mauvais soit-il, que cela n'empêche que Mme. Jones est absolument ignorante, à mon avis, de ce qui s'est tramé autour et pour elle.

Et je dis encore et toujours que la direction de ce complot est à Blue Anchor même, ou à Londres. Et l'on verra plus tard si mes soupçons sont fondés. Ce qui me fait dire cela, c'est que je comprends depuis quelques jours que l'enquête ne gravite qu'autour de Mme. Jones et de moi. C'est à dire à coté de la vérité.

Exhibit No. 33.

Translation of Exhibit No. 32.

I say and affirm that Mrs. Jones is absolutely innocent and no doubt is possible.

One day after a scene (I never understood about what), Mrs. Jones went to her room to give full vent to her unhappiness.

I went to the kitchen and asked the two servants what had happened. One of them (the younger) wrote on a piece of paper on the kitchen table in English, the following which I afterwards translated, "with such a man I should not stay long."

That evening I saw Mrs. Jones, who was still in deep trouble, and advised her not to live like this, but once for all to leave Mr. Jones.

Mrs. Jones wrote the following, which I translated: "I always suffer, I have never done wrong, not leave Mr. Jones, I have children."

Another time Mrs. Jones went away in tears—I thought that in a moment of despair she might have gone to drown herself.

I went to look for her with a servant. She came back (Mrs. Jones) towards 15 h., and when I communicated my fears to her, she answered this: "Me destroy myself, never, I always forgive Mr. Jones because he has drunk. A woman is made to suffer."

At Biarritz, at the Victoria Hotel, when she received a letter from Mr. Jones she was so happy that the tears came to her eyes, and when she received the telegram telling her to come back at once she was very happy.

No one could say that Mrs. Jones did not love her husband, for any other woman would never have put up with what she suffered.

I do not know Mrs. Jones's past, but, however bad it may be, Mrs. Jones is absolutely ignorant, in my opinion, of all the plotting going on about and for her. I repeat again and always say that the directing brains of this plot are in the Blue Anchor itself or in London, and it will be seen later if my suspicions have any foundation.

What makes me say this is that I understand since the last few days that the inquiry gravitates around Mrs. Jones and myself only, that is to say, beside the truth.

Jean Pierre Vaquier.

Exhibit No. 34.

HOTEL BILL, PALAIS D'ORSAY.

Apartment No. 22.

Grand Hotel de la Gare du Quai d'Orsay, Paris.
Note for M. Vaquier.

February 19	5	6	7	8	9
Brought forward		35	79	123	167
Apartments	35	35	35	35	
Breakfasts in Apartments		9	9	9	4.50
Total	35	79	123	167	171.50

Exhibit No. 35.

PRISONER'S PASSPORT.

(Photograph of Vaquier.)

Republique Francaise.

Departement du Prefecture de Police.
(Stamp.)
Division du Cabinet
R.I.
Prefecture de Police.
Zieme Bureau.

PASSEPORT A L'ETRANGER VALABLE POUR UN VOYAGE POUR L'ANGLETERRE.

Autorisation Ministerielle en date du 18.2.24.

Signalement.

Age de 45 ans.
cheveux.
front.
sourcils.
yeux.
nez.
bouche.
barbe.
menton
visage.
teint.
} Voir photographie.

Signes Particuliers.

Au nom du Peuple Francais.

Nous Le Prefet de Police réquerons les autorités civiles et militaires de la République Francaise et prions les autorités civiles et militaires des Etats amis ou alliés de la France de laisser passer librement.

Monsieur VAQUIER, Jean Pierre,
Ingenieur,
natif de Niort le 14.7.79 demeurant à..... de passage à Paris et de lui donner aide et protection en cas de besoin.

Fait à Paris,
Nationalité francaise.
le 8 2.24.

Signature du porteur:
J. P. VAQUIER.

Le Chef du Bureau de la Division du Cabinet.
(Sgd.)

Le Prefet de Police.
(Sgd.)

No. 1293 du Registre.

Appendix II.

Exhibit No. 36.

REPORT BY PROFESSOR WEBSTER, *re* ALFRED GEORGE POYNTER JONES, DECEASED.

St. Mary's Hospital,
Paddington, W.2.

On April 2nd, 1924, P.C. Cranford, coroner's officer, handed to me the following articles :—

1. A sealed glass bottle (stated to contain portions of organs of the above).
2. A sealed glass bottle (stated to contain portions of organs of the above).
3. A tumbler labelled "Bromo-Seltzer."
4. A tumbler and spoon.
5. A bottle labelled "Bromo-Seltzer."
6. A paper packet.

No. 1. The mouth of the jar was closed with paper, tied with string, and sealed. The bottle was labelled—"Drs. Thresh & Beale, No. 1, The Counties & Public Health Laboratories, 91 Queen Victoria Street, London, E.C.4." The bottle contained a human stomach, weighing 6 a. ounces, with 2½ ounces of brown fluid contents.

No. 2. The mouth of the jar was closed with paper, tied with string, and sealed. The bottle was labelled—"Drs. Thresh & Beale, No. 2, The Counties & Public Health Laboratories, 91 Queen Victoria Street, London, E.C.4." It contained a portion of small intestines, weighing 12 ozs.

No. 3. A glass bottle, labelled "Emerson's Bromo-Seltzer." The bottle was corked, the cork covered with brown paper, tied with string, and sealed. It was labelled—"Drs. Thresh & Beale, No. 3, The Counties & Public Health Laboratories, 91 Queen Victoria Street, London, E.C.4." The bottle contained a few drops of colourless liquid.

No. 4. A tumbler covered with brown paper, tied with string, and sealed. The spoon projected through a small hole in the paper. The tumbler was labelled—"Drs. Thresh & Beale, No. 4, The Counties & Public Health Laboratories, 91 Queen Victoria Street, London, E.C.4."

No. 5. A glass bottle, labelled "Emerson's Bromo Seltzer." The bottle was corked, wrapped in paper, marked No. 5, and tied with string. The bottle (exhibit No. 39) was labelled—"Drs. Thresh & Beale, The Counties & Public Health Laboratories, 91 Queen Victoria Street, London, E.C.4." The bottle was full of white crystalline powder.

No. 6. An envelope, labelled "No. 6," crystals picked up by Dr. Carle and P.C. Cranford, as found lying on the hearthrug of the bar parlour, on 29/3/4. It was also labelled—"Drs. Thresh & Beale, The Counties & Public Health Laboratories, 91 Queen Victoria Street, London, E.C.4." The envelope contained a minute quantity of fine white crystalline substance (a little over a 30th of a grain) wrapped in a small piece of paper.

Jean Pierre Vaquier.

On April 26th, 1924, Sir Bernard Spilsbury handed to me 8 stoppered glass jars, which I marked Nos. 7 to 14 respectively.

All these jars were marked "*Re* Alfred G. P. Jones, decd.," 26th April, 1924.

No. 7. Jar. This was labelled—"Remainder of small intestines & contents." It contained small intestines, weighing 19½ ounces.

No. 8. Jar. This was labelled—"Large intestines & contents." It contained large intestines, weighing 19 ounces.

No. 9. Jar. This was labelled—"Heart, liver and both kidneys." It contained—Liver, 58 ounces; 2 kidneys, 3¾ and 4 ounces respectively; heart, 10¾ ounces.

No. 10. Jar. This was labelled—"Spleen, 26th April, 1924." It contained a spleen, weighing 5¼ ounces.

No. 11. Jar. This was labelled—"Portion of pancreas. 26th April, 1924." It contained a portion of pancreas, weighing 1¼ ounces.

No. 12. Jar. This was labelled—"Brain & Spinal Cord." It contained—Brain, 48¼ ounces; spinal cord, 1¾ ounces.

No. 13. Jar. This was labelled—"Blood from right pleural cavity." It contained 1 ounce of blood.

No. 14. Jar. This was labelled—"Urine." It contained 1¾ ounces of urine.

I have analysed the contents of the above jars and bottles, and have to report as follows :—

I found the alkaloid strychnine to be present in the organs in the jars 1 and 2, and 7 to 14, submitted to me.

The amounts of strychnine found were as follows :—In the stomach and contents, 1/5th grain; in the liver and contents, 1/3rd grain; in the small intestines, 1/30th grain. Traces of strychnine were also present in the spleen, kidneys, urine, and brain.

No. 3 (bottle). In the few drops of liquid in this bottle I found traces of strychnine.

No. 4 (tumbler and spoon). The slight residue in the tumbler and on the spoon gave definite reactions for strychnine.

No. 5. No strychnine was detected in the contents of this bottle (exhibit No. 39).

No. 6. The particles of white powder in the envelope were found to be a salt of strychnine.

(Sgd.) John Webster, F.I.C.,
Senior Official Analyst to the Home Office.
Pathological Chemist to St. Mary's Hospital, W.2.

June 2nd, 1924.

Exhibit No. 41.

Report by Sir Bernard H. Spilsbury.

On Saturday, April 26th, 1924, I examined the exhumed body of Alfred George Poynter Jones at the Mortuary, Byfleet, Surrey.

Appendix II.

There were present at the examination—Mr. Gilbert White, Coroner; Dr. F. C. Carle, Dr. H. H. Brewer, Mr. William Kenward, deputy chief constable, and Supt. Ernest Boshier.

The body had already been removed from the coffin, which was of oak with an inner deal shell.

On the coffin lid was a metal plate bearing the inscription—"Alfred George Poynter Jones. Died 29th May, 1924. Aged 38 years."

Mr. G. H. Boutell, undertaker, identified the coffin as one made by him and used for the burial of Alfred G. P. Jones on April 4th.

He also identified the body as that of Alfred G. P. Jones.

External Examination.

The body was that of a well-nourished man.

Length about 5 ft. to 5 ft. 1 inch.

Rigor mortis was partly present in the lower limbs.

The hands were half-closed.

Hypostatic staining was marked and of a bright red colour.

The lips, finger, and toe nails had a livid colour.

The surface of the body generally was reddish and the face of a brownish red colour.

There was an area of dark brown discoloration, probably putrefactive, on the upper part of the abdominal wall.

The whites of the eyes were reddened.

There was recent bruise 1 inch in diameter at the back of the right elbow and a smaller bruise on the back of the right forearm a short distance above the wrist.

There was a post-mortem incision along the middle of the front of the body and another across the top of the head. Both were sewn up.

Internal Examination.

The scalp was normal and free from injury.

The skull was firm and heavy.

The coverings of the brain and spinal cord and the brain and cord itself were congested.

There was no hæmorrhage or other indication of disease in these organs.

The heart weighed about 11 ounces; it had been severed from its attachments and all the cavities opened. The right heart cavities and the left ventricle were somewhat dilated.

The heart muscle on subsequent microscopical examination showed some brown wasting, but no fatty or other disease. The wall on the left ventricle was thin. There was slight disease at the commencement of the main artery, the aorta. The blood was everywhere fluid and of dark colour.

The cavities round the lungs appeared to be healthy. There was congestion and œdema at the base of the right lung.

The air passages were clear.

The cavity of the abdomen was healthy.

The liver was enlarged and weighed about 59 ounces; it was soft and pale, and on microscopical examination showed marked fatty degeneration. The gall bladder and its contents were healthy.

The spleen weighed about 5½ ounces; it was normal in size, very congested, and dark in colour.

The kidneys weighed about 4 ounces each; they were normal in size and were very congested, but showed no disease on microscopical examination.

The bladder contained about 2 ounces of urine; its wall was congested.

The back of the throat was congested and the tongue furred, but not bitten or bruised.

The stomach and upper end of the small intestines were missing; the remainder of the intestines with their contents were normal.

The other organs were healthy.

Conclusions.

There was no serious disease in the body with the exception of the liver, which showed marked fatty disease. This change is consistent with alcoholic excess for some time before death. This condition does not account for the symptoms, namely, the convulsive seizures which immediately preceded death, nor does this condition account for the death of the deceased.

No natural disease was found to account for death.

The symptoms of the post-mortem appearances of the dead body, namely, the congested condition of the organs and the dark fluid blood, are consistent with death due to asphyxia consequent upon strychnine poisoning.

The two bruises found on the right arm may have been caused during the convulsive seizures.

(Sgd.) Bernard H. Spilsbury,

M.A., M.B., B.Ch.(Oxon), M.R.C.P.(London), Lecturer in Special Pathology, St. Bartholomew's Hospital, E.C.; Honorary Pathologist to the Home Office.

22nd May, 1924.

KS-382-301